The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XXXIX DECEMBER 1953 NUMBER 4

RHETORIC: ITS FUNCTIONS AND ITS SCOPE

Donald C. Bryant

WHEN a certain not always ingenuous radio spokesman for one of our large industrial concerns some years ago sought to reassure his audience on the troublesome matter of propaganda, his comfort ran thus: Propaganda, after all, is only a word for anything one says for or against anything. Either everything, therefore, is propaganda, or nothing is propaganda; so why worry?

The more seriously I take this assignment from the Editor to reexplore for the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* (1953), the ground surveyed by Hudson and Wichelns thirty years ago, and since crossed and recrossed by many another, including myself,[1] the nearer I come to a position like our friend's conclusion on propaganda. When I remember Quintilian's *Institutes* at one extreme of time, and lose myself in Kenneth Burke's "new rhetoric" at the other, I am almost forced to the position that whatever we do or say or write, or even think, in explanation of anything, or in support, or in extenuation, or in despite of anything, evinces rhetorical symptoms. Hence, either everything worth mentioning is rhetorical, or nothing is; so let's talk about something encompassable—say logic, or semantics, or persuasion, or linguistics, or scientific method, or poetics, or social psychology, or advertising, or salesmanship, or public relations, or pedagogy, or politics, or psychiatry, or symbolics—or propaganda.

But that is not the assignment. Others have dealt with those subjects, and have given us such illuminating definitive essays as "Speech as a Science" by Clarence Simon,[2] "The Spoken Word and the Great Unsaid" by Wendell Johnson,[3] "General Semantics[1952]" by Irving Lee,[4] and many other interpretive essays and *apologiae* for the various branches of our curricula and for the multiform captions in our departmental catalogues

Mr. Bryant (Ph.D., Cornell, 1937) is Professor of English and Speech at Washington University, St. Louis. Currently Associate Editor of QJS, *he has made many scholarly contributions to literary and rhetorical criticism, including notably* Edmund Burke and His Literary Friends *(Washington University Studies—New Series Language and Literature—No. 9, December, 1939).*

[1] Hoyt H. Hudson, "The Field of Rhetoric," *QJSE*, IX (April 1923), 167-180; Herbert A. Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* (New York, 1925), pp. 181-216; Donald C. Bryant, "Some Problems of Scope and Method in Rhetorical Scholarship," *QJS*, XXIII (April 1937), 182-188, and "Aspects of the Rhetorical Tradition," *QJS*, XXXVI (April and October 1950), 169-176, 326-332.

[2] *QJS*, XXXVII (October 1951), 281-298.

[3] *Ibid.* (December 1951), 419-429.

[4] *QJS*, XXXVIII (February 1952), 1-12.

and organization charts. Among these, "Rhetoric and Public Address" can hardly be thought neglected over the years, at least in the *QJS* and *SM*. But perhaps we have assumed too quickly that rhetoric is now at last well understood. On the other hand, Hudson's "The Field of Rhetoric" may be inaccessible or out of date, and Burke's "new rhetoric" too cumbersome or recondite in statement, even after Marie Hochmuth's admirable exposition of it.[5] Even if all this be true, however, one can hardly hope to clarify here what may remain obscure in the work of thirty years—or twenty centuries; but in proper humility, no doubt one can try. At least, common practice seems to presume a restatement of most complex ideas about once in a generation.

I shall not undertake to summarize Hudson's or Wichelns' pioneer essays, relevant as they are to the central problem. They and certain others like Hunt's "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric"[6] are by now woven into the fabric of our scholarship. Nor shall I try to duplicate the coverage of my two papers on "Aspects of the Rhetorical Tradition." They can be easily reread by anyone interested.

One further limitation upon the scope of this essay seems necessary: I shall not try to present a digest of rhetoric or even an explanation of the main principles of rhetorical method. Those are also easily available, from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* to the newest textbook in persuasion. Furthermore, I intend to discuss no particular system of rhetoric, but the functions and scope which any system will embrace.

Confusion in Meaning of "Rhetoric"

Very bothersome problems arise as soon as one attempts to define rhetoric, problems that lead so quickly to hair-splitting on the one hand or cosmic inclusiveness on the other, and to ethical or moral controversy, that the attempt usually ends in trifling with logomachies, gloss on Aristotle, or flat frustration. *Rhetoric* is a word in common parlance, as well as in technical use in the SAA and the Chicago school of literary critics. Hence we may presume it to have meanings which must be reckoned with, however vague, various, and disparate; for a word means what responsible users make it mean. Various as the meanings are, however, one occasionally encounters uses which seem little short of perverse, in persons who ought to know better. Not long since, a doctoral candidate in the classics, who had written as his dissertation a "rhetorical" analysis of one of St. Paul's sermons, was asked how Aristotle had defined rhetoric. Though the question, it would appear, was relevant, the candidate was unable to answer satisfactorily. Whereupon the questioner was taken firmly to task by one of his fellow examiners and was told that after all rhetoric could be adequately defined as a *way of saying something*. Now of course rhetoric may be so defined, as poetic may be defined as a way of making something; but there is little intellectual profit in either definition.

Rhetoric also enjoys several other meanings which, though more common and less perverse, serve to make analysis of it difficult. In general these are the same meanings which Hudson reviewed thirty years ago: bombast; high-sounding words without content; oratorical falsification to hide meaning; sophistry; ornamentation and the study of figures of speech; most commonly among academic folk, Freshman English; and finally, least commonly of all, the whole art of spoken discourse, especially persuasive discourse. This last meaning has gained somewhat in currency in thirty years, especially

[5] *Ibid.* (April 1952), 133-144.
[6] *Studies . . . in Honor of James Albert Winans*, pp. 3-60.

among scholars in speech and renaissance literature.[7] During the same period the use of the term *rhetoric* (or the combinations *composition and rhetoric* and *grammar and rhetoric*) to label courses and textbooks in Freshman English has somewhat declined, and simultaneously the "rhetorical" content of them has declined also. The tendency now is to prefer just *Composition* or *English Composition*, or to resort to such loaded names as *Basic Writing*, *Effective Writing*, *Problems in Writing*, *Writing with a Purpose*, or *Communication and Analysis*.

In one of his early speeches, President Eisenhower declared that we want action from the Russians, not rhetoric, as evidence of their desire for peaceful settlement. Here is the common use of *rhetoric* to mean empty language, or language used to deceive, without honest intention behind it. Without question this use is in harmony with the current climate of meaning where what our opponents say is rhetoric, and what we say is something else. Hence our attempt to define rhetoric leads almost at once into questions of morals and ethics.

Rhetoric as figures of speech or artificial elegance of language is also a healthy perennial, nurtured in literary scholarship and criticism as well as lay comment. Hence the second of the two meanings of *rhetorical* in *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* is "emphasizing style, often at the expense of thought." Here we encounter a second obscuring or limiting factor in our attempt at definition. We are to describe rhetoric in terms of those *elements* of a verbal composition for which it is to be held responsible. This mode of procedure has always been attractive. It can produce interesting and plausible conclusions, and it can be defended as schematically satisfying and pedagogically convenient. Thus it proved in the *trivium* of the middle ages and renaissance. If grammar has charge of the correctness of discourse, and if logic has charge of the intellectual content, then it is natural to assign to rhetoric the management of the language of discourse (or the *elocutio*), and if we do not include poetic in our system, the imaginative and emotional content also.

Another definition in the *New Collegiate Dictionary* points to the identification of rhetoric not with the elements of verbal composition but with the *forms* or *genres:* "The art of expressive speech or of discourse, orig. of oratory, now esp. of literary composition; esp., the art of writing well in prose, as disting. from versification and elocution." This approach is promising and on the whole the most popular through the ages. "Originally of oratory, now especially the art of writing well in prose—" this phrase does well enough as a general description of the scope of rhetoric in ancient Greece, as Baldwin has pointed out, when prose itself was virtually defined as oratory and history, and when even history was composed largely in the spirit of oratory. That is, rhetoric could be the art of prose when prose was predominantly concerned with the intentional, directional energizing of truth, of finding in any given situation all the available means of persuasion, and of using as many of them as good sense dictated.

Even then, however, the weakness of genres as the basis for constructing theories or writing handbooks was evident. What is the art of Plato's dialogues, which are in prose? or of Sappho's compositions, which are poems? Neither

[7] In his *The Ethics of Rhetoric* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1953), which has appeared since this article has been in proof, Richard M. Weaver of the College at the University of Chicago makes an interesting and useful effort to restore rhetoric to a central and respectable position among the arts of language and to assign it the function of giving effectiveness to truth.

poetic nor rhetoric is adequate to either. The difficulty multiplies as variety in the kinds of compositions increases in Roman, renaissance, and modern times, and as print supplements—and often supplants—speech as the medium of verbal communication. As *poetic,* the art of imitation in language, became crystallized in Roman and renaissance learning as the theory and practice of the drama (especially tragedy) and the epic, so *rhetoric,* in Quintilian's and Cicero's theory the whole operative philosophy of civil leadership, showed in practice as the art of making winning speeches in the law courts, or later in public exhibitions. The very doctrine in rhetoric of the epideictic or ceremonial speech, as I shall show later, is excellent evidence of the weakness of the types or *genres* as the basis for definition.

All these meanings of rhetoric, in spite of their limitations, contribute something to the exposition of our subject, and the pursuit of each has yielded lucrative insights into the subject, or at least into the problem. Some of them, especially rhetoric as bombast, as excessive ornamentation, and as deceit, are evidence of the falling off of rhetoricians from time to time from the broad philosophy of the art which they inherited from the founders. For a redefinition, therefore, I know no better way of beginning than to return to that broad philosophy.

Working Definition of Rhetoric

First of all and primarily, therefore, I take rhetoric to be the *rationale of informative and suasory discourse.* All its other meanings are partial or morally-colored derivatives from that primary meaning. This rhetoric has been, at least since Aristotle; and at least since Aristotle there has existed a comprehensive, fundamental codification of its principles. It would be idolatrous to suggest that Aristotle uttered the first and last authentic words on rhetoric, or that his system is still adequate, or that it was completely satisfactory even for the Greeks of his day. Like his poetic theory, however, it enjoys unequalled scientific eminence in its field though it has sustained many additions and modifications through the centuries. Its limitations are historical rather than philosophical. Like the limitations of his poetic, the limitations of his rhetoric derive mainly from his failure to consider phenomena which had not yet occurred and to make use of learnings which had not yet been developed.

Now as then, therefore, what Aristotle said of the nature and principles of public address, of the discovery of all the available means of persuasion in any given case, must stand as the broad background for any sensible rhetorical system. Much of Aristotle's formulation, even in detail, survives ungainsaid and can only be rearranged and paraphrased by subsequent writers. Again to cite a parallel with his poetic: though the relative importance of plot in drama has shifted radically since Aristotle, when good plots are made their excellences will still be best discovered by the application of Aristotle's criteria. Similarly, though modern psychology is very different from that of the Greeks, and doubtless more scientific, modern enlightenment has produced no new method of analyzing an audience which can replace Aristotle's.

Aristotle, however, identified rhetoric with persuasion. His chief interests lay in the speaking to popular audiences in the law court and in the legislative assembly, and his system of classification and analysis obviously was framed with those types of speaking as its principal object. Some means of persuasion, however, in spite of Aristotle's comprehensive definition, are not within the scope of rhetoric.

Gold and guns, for example, are certainly persuasive, and the basic motives which make them persuasive, profit and self-preservation, may enter the field of rhetoric; but applied directly to the persons to be persuaded, guns and gold belong to commerce or coercion, not to rhetoric.

No more shall we admit the persuasive use of all symbols as belonging to rhetoric. Undoubtedly the persuasive force of pictures, colors, designs, non-language sounds such as fog horns and fire alarms, and all such devices of symbolic significance is great and useful. Traffic lights, however, are not normally agents of rhetorical influence. No more, in themselves, are elephants, donkeys, lions, illuminated bottles of whiskey, or animated packs of cigarettes. Their use has a kinship to rhetoric, and when they are organized in a matrix of verbal discourse, they become what Aristotle called the extrinsic or non-artistic means of persuasion. They are instruments of the wielder of public opinion, and they are staples of two techniques which must be recognized as strongly rhetorical—advertising and propaganda. Unless we are to claim practically all interhuman activity as the field of rhetoric, however, some limits must be admitted, even within the field of persuasion. True, in the "new rhetoric" of Kenneth Burke, where the utmost extension rather than practical limit-setting is the aim, any manifestation of "identification," conscious or unconscious, is within rhetoric. Though the classic limitations of rhetoric are too narrow, others are too broad. Therefore I am assuming the traditional limitation to discourse.

Let us look now at Aristotle's apparent failure to include exposition as well as persuasion within rhetoric. Ancillary to persuasion, of course, exposition is clearly included. The idea of *demonstration*, the characteristic result of the logical mode, implies the most perfect exposition for audiences susceptible of reasoned instruction. Furthermore, another aspect of Aristotle's system admits exposition to independent status. At the expense of a slight venture into heresy (though I believe only a benign heresy) I suggest that any systematic construction of human phenomena, even Aristotle's, will either leave out something important and significant, or will include a category, however named, which is, in effect, "miscellaneous." That I think Aristotle did in discussing the rhetoric of the ceremonial or epideictic speech. The success of his categories, even so, is remarkable. The extension and effective application to the ceremonial speech in general of the principles of the persuasive speech whose end is active decision, provide very plausible coverage of that somewhat anomalous form. The three-fold, tripartite classification of speeches was too nearly perfect to abandon:

Forensic (time, past; ends, justice and injustice; means, accusation and defense.)
Epideictic (time, present; ends, honor and dishonor; means, praise and blame.)
Deliberative (time, future; ends, the expedient and inexpedient; means, exhortation and dehortation.)

When the problems of what to do with time-present in the system, and with Pericles' funeral oration among the observed phenomena had to be solved, the coincidence was too attractive to be resisted. It provided for a piece of practical realism which no system should be allowed to defeat. Through that adjustment Aristotle admitted within the scope of rhetoric the predominantly literary performance on the one hand and gave an opening on the other for the primarily informative and instructional as well as the demonstrative and exhibitionistic. Through this third category rhetoric embraces, in a persuasion-centered system, the *docere* and *delec-*

tare, the teach and delight, of the Roman and renaissance rhetoric-poetic and permits them an independent status outside their strictly ancillary or instrumental functions in persuasion.

Aristotle's system, therefore, and his rationale of effective speaking comprehend with very little violence the art of the good man skilled in speaking of Cicero and Quintilian, or Baldwin's equation of rhetoric to the art of prose whose end is giving effectiveness to truth[8]—effectiveness considered in terms of what happens to an audience, usually a popular or lay audience as distinguished from the specialized or technical audience of the scientific or dialectical demonstration. This distinction, strictly speaking, is a practical rather than a logical limitation, a limitation of degree rather than kind. No matter what the audience, when the speaker evinces skill in getting into their minds, he evinces rhetorical skill.

If the breadth of scope which I have assigned to rhetoric is implicit in Aristotle's system, the basic delimitation of that scope finds early and explicit statement there. Rhetoric is not confined in application to any specific subjects which are exclusively its own. Rhetoric is method, not subject. But if it has no special subjects, neither are all subjects within its province. In its suasory phase, at least, rhetoric is concerned, said Aristotle, only with those questions about which men dispute, that is, with the contingent—that which is dependent in part upon factors which cannot be known for certain, that which can be otherwise. Men do not dispute about what is known or certainly knowable by them. Hence the characteristic concern of rhetoric is broadly with questions of justice and injustice, of the expedient and the inexpedient (of the desirable and undesirable, of the good and the bad), of praise and blame, or honor and dishonor.

To questions such as these and their almost infinite subsidiary questions, vital and perennial as they are in the practical operation of human society, the best answers can never be certain but only more or less probable. In reasoning about them, men at best must usually proceed from probable premise to probable conclusion, seldom from universal to universal. Hence Aristotle described the basic instrument of rhetoric, the enthymeme, as a kind of syllogism based on probabilities and signs.

Rhetoric, therefore, is distinguished from the other instrumental studies in its preoccupation with informed opinion rather than with scientific demonstration. It is the counterpart, said Aristotle, of dialectic. Strictly speaking, dialectic also may be said to attain only probability, not scientific certainty, like physics (and, perhaps, theology). The methodology, however, is the methodology of formal logic and it deals in universals. Hence it arrives at a very high degree of probability, for it admits the debatable only in the assumption of its premises. Rhetoric, however, because it normally deals with matters of uncertainty for the benefit of popular audiences, must admit probability not only in its premises but in its method also. This is the ground upon which Plato first, and hundreds of critics since, have attacked rhetoric—that it deals with opinion rather than knowledge. This is the ground also from which certain scholars have argued,[9] after some of the mediaeval fathers, that rhetoric really deals, characteristically, not with genuine probability but only with adumbration and suggestion. It is, they say, distinguished from dialectic

[8] *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic* (New York, 1924), p. 5.

[9] For example, Craig La Drière, "Rhetoric as 'Merely Verbal' Art," *English Institute Essays —1948*, ed. by D. A. Robertson, Jr. (New York, 1949), pp. 123-152.

in *degree* of probability—dialectic very high, and rhetoric very low.

The epistemological question is interesting, and in a world of philosophers where only certain knowledge was ever called upon to decide questions of human behavior, it would be the central question. Rhetoric exists, however, because a world of certainty is not the world of human affairs. It exists because the world of human affairs is a world where there must be an alternative to certain knowledge on the one hand and pure chance or whimsey on the other. The alternative is informed opinion, the nearest approach to knowledge which the circumstances of decision in any given case will permit. The art, or science, or method whose realm this is, is rhetoric. Rhetoric, therefore, is the method, the strategy, the organon of the principles for deciding best the undecidable questions, for arriving at solutions of the unsolvable problems, for instituting method in those vital phases of human activity where no method is inherent in the total subject-matter of decision. The resolving of such problems is the province of the "Good man skilled in speaking." It always has been, and it is still. Of that there can be little question. And the comprehensive rationale of the functioning of that good man so far as he is skilled in speaking, so far as he is a wielder of public opinion, is rhetoric.

The Problems of Vocabulary In This Essay

Traditionally *rhetoric* and *oratory* have been the standard terms for the theory and the product. The *rhetor* was the speaker, the addresser of the public, or the teacher of speaking; the *rhetorician,* the teacher of rhetoric or the formulator of the principles of rhetoric. Hence the special bias of the terms as I use them has been and probably still is oral. That is a practical bias and is not carelessly to be thrown away. From the beginning of publication in writing, however, essentially rhetorical performances, whether already spoken or to be spoken, have been committed to paper and circulated to be read rather than heard—from Isocrates' *Panathenaicus* or Christ's *Sermon on the Mount* to Eisenhower's message on the state of the nation. Furthermore, for centuries now, especially since the invention and cheapening of the art of printing, the agitator, the teacher, the preacher, the wielder of public opinion has used the press quite independently of the platform. Hence, obviously, rhetoric must be understood to be the rationale of informative and suasory discourse both spoken and written: of Milton's *Aeropagitica* as well as Cromwell's Address to the Rump Parliament; of John Wilkes' *North Briton* as well as Chatham's speech on the repeal of the Stamp Act; of Tom Paine's *Common Sense* as much as Patrick Henry's Address to the Virginia Assembly; of Swift's pamphlet on the *Conduct of the Allies* as well as Dr. Sacheverell's sermon on Passive Obedience; of George Sokolsky's syndicated columns in the press equally with Edward R. Murrow's radio commentaries or Kenneth McFarland's appearances before conventions of the Chambers of Commerce. I will use *rhetoric* and *rhetorical* with that breadth of scope.

Furthermore, the terms *orator* and *oratory* have taken on, like *rhetoric* itself, rather limited or distorted meanings, not entirely undeserved perhaps, which make them no longer suitable for the designation of even the normal *oral* rhetorical performance. *Practitioner of public address,* or some such hyphenated monstrosity as *speaker-writer,* might be used as a generic term for the product of rhetoric, but the disadvantages of such manipulations of vocabulary are obvious. I am using the terms *speech* and *speaker*

for both written and oral performance and written and oral performer, unless the particular circumstances obviously imply one or the other. Likewise, in place of such a formula as *listener-reader*, I shall use *audience*, a usage not uncommon anyway.

One must face still another problem of vocabulary, that of the term *rhetoric* in the three distinguishable senses in which I use it: (1) as the rationale of informative and suasory discourse, a body of principle and precept for the creation and analysis of speeches; (2) as a quality which characterizes that kind of discourse and distinguishes it from other kinds; (3) as a study of the phenomenon of informative and suasory discourse in the social context. Similarly, I fear, the term *rhetorician* will sometimes mean the formulator and philosopher of rhetorical theory; sometimes the teacher of the technique of discourse; sometimes the speaker with rhetorical intention; and finally the student or scholar whose concern is the literary or social or behavioral study of rhetoric. I have been tempted to invent terms to avoid certain of these ambiguities, such as *logology*, or even *rhetoristic* (parallel with *sophistic*), but the game would probably not be worth the candle.

In summary, rhetoric is the rationale of informative and suasory discourse, it operates chiefly in the areas of the contingent, its aim is the attainment of maximum probability as a basis for public decision, it is the organizing and animating principle of all subject-matters which have a relevant bearing on that decision. Now let us turn to the question of the subject-matters in which rhetoric most characteristically functions and of the relations it bears to special subject-matters.

Subjects of Rhetorical Discourse

Wrote Aristotle, "The most important subjects of general deliberation . . . are practically five, viz. finance, war and peace, the defense of the country, imports and exports, and legislation." This is still the basic list, though legislation now would be far more generally inclusive than it was to the Athenian assembly. In addition, within the scope of rhetorical discourse fall the subjects of forensic address—crime and its punishment and all the concerns of justice and injustice. Furthermore, the concerns of teaching, preaching—moral, intellectual, practical, and spiritual instruction and exhortation—and commercial exploitation, wherever the problems of adaptation of idea and information to the group mind are concerned, depend upon rhetorical skill for their fruition. Thus we are brought again to the position that the rhetorical factor is pervasive in the operative aspects of society.

Does this mean that the speaker must be a specialist in all subjects, as well as in rhetorical method? Cicero seemed willing to carry the demands thus far, at least in establishing his ideal orator; and this implication has been ridiculed from Plato onwards for the purpose of discrediting first the claims of the sophists and then all men "skilled in speaking." Plainly, in practice and in plausible human situations, the suggestion is absurd. Does the public speaker or the columnist or the agitator have to be a military specialist in order rightly to urge peace or war? Does the citizen have to be a dentist and a chemist and a pathologist intelligently to advocate the use of fluorine in the municipal water supply? He does not become a specialist in these fields, of course, any more than the head of an industrial plant is the technical master of the specialties of all the men who serve under him. "He attempts to learn the authorities and sources of information in each, and to develop a method which he can apply to specific

problems as they arise. He learns, in any given situation, what questions to ask and to answer. The peculiar contribution of the rhetorician is the discovery and use, to the common good, of those things which move men to [understanding and] action."[10] Looked at another way, the relation of rhetoric to the subject-matters of economics, or public health, or theology, or chemistry, or agriculture is like the relation of hydraulic engineering to water, under the specific circumstances in which the engineer is to construct his dam or his pumping station or his sewage system, and in view of the specific results he is to obtain. He develops a method for determining what questions to ask and answer from all that which can be known about water. If he is a good hydraulics engineer, he will see to it that his relevant knowledge is sound, as the good speaker will see to it that his relevant knowledge of hydraulic engineering is the best obtainable if he is to urge or oppose the building of a dam in the St. Lawrence River. If either is ignorant, or careless, or dishonest, he is culpable as a man and as a rhetorician or hydraulics engineer.

It was not the scientific chronologist, the astronomer Lord Macclesfield, who secured the adoption in England of the Gregorian calendar, thoroughly as he understood the subject in all its mathematical, astronomical, and chronometrical aspects. It was the Earl of Chesterfield, learning from the chronologist all that was essential to the particular situation, and knowing rhetoric and the British Parliament, who was able to impress upon his fellows not necessarily the validity of the calculations but the desirability and the feasibility of making a change. If the truth of scientific knowledge had been left to its own inherent force with Parliament, we would doubtless be many more days out of phase with the sun than England was in 1751. As Aristotle observed in his brief and basic justification of rhetoric, truth itself has a tendency to prevail over error; but in competition with error, where skillful men have an interest in making error prevail, truth needs the help of as attractive and revealing a setting as possible. In the Kingdom of Heaven, truth may be its own sole advocate, but it needs mighty help if it is to survive in health among the nations on earth. As Fielding wrote of prudence in *Tom Jones:* "It is not enough that your designs, nay, that your actions, are intrinsically good; you must take care that they shall appear so. If your inside be never so beautiful, you must preserve a fair outside also. This must be constantly looked to."[11]

In this sense even honest rhetoric is fundamentally concerned with appearances, not to the disregard of realities as Plato and his successors have industriously charged, but to the enforcement of realities. Rhetoric at the command of honest men strives that what is desirable shall appear desirable, that what is vicious shall appear vicious. It intends that the true or probably true shall seem so, that the false or doubtful shall be vividly realized for what it is. A bridge or an automobile or a clothes-line must not only *be* strong but must *appear* to be so. This fact has been an obstacle to the use of many new structural materials. Accustomed to an older kind, we have been reluctant to accept the adequacy of a new, more fragile-seeming substance. Hence one important reason for surrounding steel columns with stone pillars is the necessity of making them seem as strong as their predecessors. Appearances, then, must be the concern of the wielder of public opinion, the

[10] Hudson, "Field of Rhetoric," *QJSE*, IX (April 1923), 177.

[11] Book III, Chapter 7. Modern Library Edn., p. 97.

rhetorician. Through ignorance or malice, to be sure, skill in establishing appearances may be applied to deceive. This is a grave peril which must be the concern of all men of good will. Knowledge of the devices of sophistry will always be acquired by those whose purposes are bad; ignorance of them will provide no defense for the rest. No great force can be used without hazard, or ignored without hazard. The force understood, rather than the force not understood, is likely to be the force controlled. That understanding is provided by rhetoric, the technique of discourse addressed to the enlightenment and persuasion of the generality of mankind—the basic instrument for the creation of informed public opinion and the consequent expedient public action.

Occasions of Rhetorical Discourse

Whether we will or no, we cannot escape rhetoric, either the doing or the being done to. We require it. As Edmund Burke wrote, "Men want reasons to reconcile their minds to what is done, as well as motives originally to act right."[12] Whether we seek advice or give it, the nature of our talk, as being "addressed," and of the talk of which we are the audience, as being addressed to us, necessitates speaking the language of the audience or we had as well not speak at all. That process is the core of rhetoric. It goes on as genuinely, and is often managed as skillfully, over the frozen-meats counter of the local supermarket as in the halls of Congress; on the benches in front of the Boone County Court House on Saturday afternoon before election as below the benches of the Supreme Court the next Wednesday morning; around the table where a new labor contract is being negotiated as in the pulpit of Sainte-Marie de Chaillot where Bossuet is pronoucing the funeral oration upon Henriette d'Angleterre; in the Petition from Yorkshire to King George III for redress of grievances as in the Communist Manifesto or the Declaration of Independence.

As we are teachers, and as we are taught, we are involved with rhetoric. The success of the venture depends on a deliberate or instinctive adjustment of idea-through-speaker-to-audience-in-a-particular-situation. Pedagogy is the rhetoric of teaching, whether formally in the classroom or the book, or informally in the many incidental situations of our days and nights. The psychological principle, for example, that we learn through association becomes a rhetorical principle when we use it to connect one day's lesson with what has gone before. It is the same principle by which Burke attempted to establish in the minds of the House of Commons the rights of American colonists when he identified the colonists with Englishmen, whose rights were known.

As we are readers of newspapers and magazines and all such information-giving and opinion-forming publications, and as we write for them, we are receiving or initiating rhetorical discourse, bad or good, effective or ineffective. The obligations of the journalist as investigator of the facts, as thinker about the facts, as discoverer of ideas and analyst and critic of ideas, are fundamental. They demand all the knowledge and skill that the political, scientific, and technical studies can provide. The journalist's distinctive job, however, is writing for his audience the highest grade of informative and suasory discourse that the conditions of his medium will permit. Whether editorial writer, commentator, or plain news-writer, reaching into his audience's mind is his problem. If the people who buy the paper miss the import, the paper might as well not

[12] *Correspondence* (1844), I, 217.

be published. Call it *journalism* if you choose; it is the rhetoric of the press: "it is always public opinion that the press seeks to change, one way or another, directly or indirectly."[13] Seldom can the journalist wait for the solution of a problem before getting into the fray, whether the question be a more efficient way of handling municipal finances or independence for India. He must know the right questions to ask and the bases for answering them with greatest probability for his audience now. That is his rhetorical knowledge.

The same is true of the radio and television news reporter, news analyst, and commentator. He must have rhetorical skill to survive in his occupation, and he must have knowledge and integrity if his effect is to be beneficial rather than destructive to informed public opinion. His staple, also, whether good or bad, is rhetoric. His efforts are aimed at the public mind and are significant only as they affect the public mind. If he is an honest rhetorician, he does not imply of most things, "It is so because," but only "I believe so because"; or "I recommend so because it seems probable where I cannot be sure." If he is tempted into exploiting the force of extravagant and authoritative assertion, his morals rather than his rhetoric have gone awry. Whether the use be honest or dishonest, the instrument is rhetoric.

It is obvious and commonplace that the agitator, the political speaker, the pamphleteer, the advocate, the preacher, the polemicist and apologist, the adviser of kings and princes, the teacher of statesmen, the reformer and counter-reformer, the fanatic in religion, diet, or economics, the mountebank and messiah, have enhanced the stature of a noble discourse or have exploited or degraded, shallow, and dishonest discourse. It matters not that we resort to exalted names for the one—eloquence, genius, philosophy, logic, discourse of reason; and for the other, labels of reproach and contempt—sophistry, glibness, demagoguery, chicanery, "rhetoric." That naming process itself is one of the most familiar techniques of rhetoric. The fact is that in their characteristic preoccupation with manipulating the public mind, they are one. They must not all be approved or emulated, but they must all be studied as highly significant social phenomena, lest we be ignorant of them, and hence powerless before them, for good or for ill.

Similarly, though perhaps not so easily acceptable into rhetoric, we must recognize most of what we know as advertising, salesmanship, propaganda, "public relations," and commercial, political, and national "information" services. I shall have some special consideration to give to these later. At present I merely cite them as great users of rhetoric. In this day of press, radio, and television perhaps their rhetoric is that most continuously and ubiquitously at work on the public.

Relations of Rhetoric To Other Learnings

These, then, are fundamental rhetorical situations. In them human beings are so organizing language as to effect a change in the knowledge, the understanding, the ideas, the attitudes, or the behavior of other human beings. Furthermore, they are so organizing that language as to make the change as agreeable, as easy, as active, and as secure as possible—as the Roman rhetoric had it, to teach, to delight, and to move (or to bend). What makes a situation rhetorical is the focus upon accomplishing something predetermined and directional with an audience. To that end many

[13] *The Press and Society: A Book of Readings*, ed. by George L. Bird and Frederic E. Merwin (New York, 1951), preface, p. iv.

knowledges and sciences, concerning both what is external to audiences and what applies to audiences themselves, may be involved, many of which I have discussed in a previous essay.[14] These knowledges, however, have to be organized, managed, given places in strategy and tactics, set into coordinated and harmonious movement towards the listener as the end, towards what happens to him and in him. In short, they have to be *put to use,* for, as Bacon said, studies themselves "teach not their own use; but that is a wisdom without them, and above them, won by observation." "Studies themselves do give forth directions too much at large, except they be bounded in by experience."[15] Rhetoric teaches their use towards a particular end. It is that "observation," that "experience" codified, given a rationale. Other learnings are chiefly concerned with the discovery of ideas and phenomena and of their relations to each other within more or less homogeneous and closed systems. Rhetoric is primarily concerned with the relations of ideas to the thoughts, feelings, motives, and behavior of men. Rhetoric as distinct from the learnings which it uses is dynamic; it is concerned with movement. It *does* rather than *is.* It is method rather than matter. It is chiefly involved with bringing about a condition, rather than discovering or testing a condition. Even psychology, which is more nearly the special province of rhetoric than is any other study, is descriptive of conditions, but not of the uses of those conditions.

So far as it is method, rhetoric is like the established procedures of experimental science and like logic. As the method for solving problems of human action in the areas of the contingent and the probable, however, it does not enjoy a privilege which is at the same time the great virtue and the great limitation of science and logic—it cannot choose its problems in accordance with the current capacities of its method, or defer them until method is equal to the task. Rhetoric will postpone decision as long as feasible; indeed one of its most valuable uses in the hands of good men, is to prevent hasty and premature formulation of lines of conduct and decision. In this it is one with science—and good sense. But in human affairs, where the whole is usually greater than the most complete collection of the parts, decisions—makings up of the mind—cannot always wait until all the contingencies have been removed and solutions to problems have been tested in advance. Rhetoric, therefore, must take undemonstrable problems and do its best with them when decision is required. We must decide when the blockade is imposed whether to withdraw from Berlin or to undertake the air lift, not some time later when perhaps some of the contingencies may have been removed. And the making of the choice forever precludes trying out and testing the other possibilities under the circumstances which would have prevailed had we chosen differently at first. Likewise we must make a choice on the first Tuesday in November, whether we are scientifically sure or not. In each case, rhetoric, good or bad, must be the strategy of enlightening opinion for that choice.

To restate our central idea still another way: rhetoric, or the rhetorical, is the function in human affairs which governs and gives direction to that creative activity, that process of critical analysis, that branch of learning, which address themselves to the whole phenomenon of the designed use of language for the promulgation of information, ideas, and attitudes. Though it is instrumental in the discovery of ideas and information,

[14] "Aspects of the Rhetorical Tradition" (1950), see above, note 1.
[15] "Of Studies."

its characteristic function is the publication, the publicizing, the humanizing, the animating of them for a realized and usually specific audience. At its best it seeks the "energizing of truth," in order to make "reason and the will of God prevail." But except in science, and no doubt theology, the promulgation of *truth,* sure or demonstrable, is out of the question. Normally the rhetorical function serves as high a degree of probability as the combination of subject, audience, speaker, and occasion admits. Rhetoric may or may not be involved (though the speaker-writer must be) in the determination of the validity of the ideas being promulgated. Such determination will be the province in any given situation of philosophy, ethics, physics, economics, politics, eugenics, medicine, hydraulics, or bucolics. To rhetoric, however, and to no other rationale, belongs the efficiency—the validity if you will—of the relations in the idea-audience-speaker situation.

Functioning of Rhetoric

We are ready now, perhaps, if we have not been ready much sooner, to proceed to the question of how rhetoric works, what it accomplishes in an audience. Speaking generally, we may say that the rhetorical function is the *function of adjusting ideas to people and of people to ideas.* This process may be thought of as a continuum from the complete modification or accommodation of ideas to audiences (as is sometimes said, "telling people only what they want to hear") at the one extreme, to complete regeneration at the other (such perfect illumination that the "facts speak for themselves"). This continuum may, therefore, be said to have complete flattery (to use Plato's unflattering epithet) at one end and the Kingdom of Heaven at the other! Good rhetoric usually functions somewhere well in from the extremes. There, difficult and strange ideas have to be modified without being distorted or invalidated; and audiences have to be prepared through the mitigation of their prejudices, ignorance, and irrelevant sets of mind without being dispossessed of their judgments. The adjustment of ideas to people, for example, was being undertaken by the Earl of Chatham in his speech for the repeal of the Stamp Act, when he agreed that Parliament had legislative supremacy over the Colonies but that legislative supremacy did not include the right to tax without representation. And when Booker T. Washington assured the Southern white folk that they and the Negroes could be as separate as the fingers in social affairs and as united as the hand in economic, he was adjusting people to the idea of real freedom for his race.

The moral disturbances which rhetoric and rhetorical activity seem to breed do not usually result from this process of mutual accommodation itself. Most of them arise when the speaker tries so to adjust ideas to people that the ideas are basically falsified, or when he attempts so to adjust people to ideas as to deform or anesthetize the people. Report has it that after Senator Hiram Johnson had campaigned through rural New England charging that England would have three votes to one for the United States in the League of Nations, he was taxed by a critic with misrepresenting the nature of the British Empire. One could not assume, so Johnson's critic declared, that Canada and South Africa would vote with England as a single bloc. "That may be," Johnson is said to have replied, "but New England farmers do not know the nature of the British Empire, and they do know common arithmetic." That is adjusting ideas to people so far as to falsify the basic idea. In the other direction, stimulating the "Red-menace-in-the-air-we-breathe" ter-

ror in order to adjust people to the idea of giving up their right of dissent is an effort to dispossess people of their judgments.

In terms of the old, but still convenient, faculty psychology, the terms in which rhetoric is most frequently attacked—reason, imagination, passions (emotions), judgment, will—rhetoric may still be described as the method of applying "reason to imagination for the better moving of the will." To complete our broad idea of the scope of rhetoric we should add "and the better clarification of the understanding." That is Francis Bacon's succinct statement of how rhetoric functions in the audience,[16] and it is still a good one. It establishes rhetoric squarely as an instrumental learning which manages the creative powers of the whole logical-psychological man toward a single dynamic end.

Rhetoric, therefore, has the greatest possible involvement with the logical and psychological studies. These learnings must be the core of the speaker's equipment. They are the *sine qua non* in the knowledge through which rhetoric must function. In the good rhetoric which Plato described in the *Phaedrus*, after knowledge of the truth, he saw the equipment of the rhetorically skilled man to consist in knowledge of the various possible kinds of arguments, knowledge of the various kinds of souls, and knowledge of which kinds of souls will be affected by which kinds of arguments—that is, knowledge of the rational processes and knowledge of the mutual adaptation of these processes to audiences. Furthermore, in the great counter-Platonic *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, the first Book is devoted chiefly to the rational processes of rhetoric, and the next Book is the first extant comprehensive treatise on individual and group psychology. Likewise, in one of the best of the recent books on liberal education, which is, therefore, something like a basic statement on rhetoric, Hoyt Hudson sees the fundamental equipment of the liberally educated man to require three parts: the Arm of Information, the Arm of Operative Logic, and the Arm of Imagination.[17] Of these, in practical affairs, rhetoric is based on the second and third, and the first must be the starting place of the speaker in each particular situation.

Where in this pattern, then, does emotion come in, that famous roughneck who is said to spoil the rational life and vitiate the logic of behavior? As Hudson and many others have observed, and as Bacon knew well, emotion is a derivative of both reason and imagination. Love of truth and of the good life must be the results of any genuinely rational functioning, that is, of operative logic; and vivid realization of experience, which is imagination, can hardly occur without those strong emotional accompaniments which, in practice, have given rise to the identifying of emotion with imagination. This point seems hardly to need laboring over again. Hudson's book gives it adequate coverage, and I have summarized the traditional position of rhetoric and rhetoricians on it in the essay already mentioned.[18] The position is that a complete rhetoric, and that is the kind of rhetoric which we are discussing, knows the whole man and seeks to bring to bear the whole man in achieving its ends—what he is and what he thinks he is, what he believes and what he thinks he believes, what he wants and what he tells himself he wants. Towards its special ends, rhetoric recognizes the primacy of

[16] From *The Advancement of Learning*. See Karl R. Wallace, *Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric* (Chapel Hill, 1943), p. 27.

[17] *Educating Liberally* (Stanford University, 1945), pp. 10 ff.

[18] Above, note 14.

rational processes, their primacy in time as well as in importance, as Bacon's definition implies—applying reason to the imagination. Just so poetry recognizes the primacy for its purposes of the imagination. But rhetoric has always been akin to poetry—for long periods of history it has in fact annexed poetry—in its recognition of the honest and highly important power of imagination and of that emotion which does not supplant but supports reason, and sometimes even transcends it. Thus Sir Philip Sidney and most literary theorists of the renaissance attributed to poetry the distinctly rhetorical function of using imagination to create what might be called historical fictions to give power and life to ideas. Rhetoric recognizes the strength of the fictions men live by, as well as those they live under;[19] and it aims to fortify the one and explode the other. Rhetoric aims at what is *worth* doing, what is *worth* trying. It is concerned with *values*, and values are established with the aid of imaginative realization, not through rational determination alone; and they gain their force through emotional animation.

We have observed that psychology, human nature, has been a staple of rhetorical learning through the ages. No doubt, therefore, scientific psychology will have more and more to contribute to modern rhetoric. The first notable attempt to ground rhetoric in a systematic modern psychology was made by George Campbell in his *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776), in which he stated as his purpose

> to exhibit . . . a tolerable sketch of the human mind; and, aided by the lights which the poet and the orator so amply furnish, to disclose its secret movements, tracing its principal channels of perception and action, as near as possible, to their source: and, on the other hand, from the science of human nature, to ascertain with greater precision, the radical principles of that art, whose object it is, by the use of language, to operate on the soul of the hearer, in the way of informing, convincing, pleasing, moving, or persuading.[20]

That same purpose governs our contemporary writers of treatises and textbooks on public speaking, argumentation, and persuasion, and most of them include as up-to-date a statement as possible of the psychological and the rational bases of rhetoric. It is a commonplace that of the studies recently come to new and promising maturity, psychology, especially social psychology, and cultural anthropology have much to teach modern rhetoric and to correct or reinterpret in traditional rhetoric. The same may be said of the various new ventures into the study of meaning, under the general head of semantics. How language *means* is obviously important to the rationale of informative and suasory discourse. Nevertheless, in spite of I. A. Richards' book,[21] the theory of meaning is not *the* philosophy of rhetoric, any more than is the psychology of perception. Rhetoric is the organizer of all such for the wielding of public opinion.

Advertising, Salesmanship, and Propaganda

Now that we have sketched the rhetorical process functioning at its best for the exposition and dissemination of ideas in the wielding of public opinion, with the ethical and pathetic modes of proof in ancillary relation to the logical, with the imagination aiding and reenforcing the rational, let us turn to some of the partial, incomplete, perhaps misused, rhetorics which I have already mentioned briefly.

It is axiomatic that men do not live by reason alone or even predominantly,

[19] See the very relevant analysis of some of the fictions in the ideology of American business in C. Wright Mills, *White Collar* (New York, 1951), Ch. 3, "The Rhetoric of Competition."

[20] 7th edn. (London, 1823), pp. vii-viii.

[21] *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (New York, 1936).

though reason is such a highly prized commodity and stands in so high a repute even among the unreasoning and unreasonable, that men prefer to tell themselves and to be told that they make up their minds and determine their choices from reason and the facts. Intellectual activity, both learning and thinking, is so difficult that man tends to avoid it wherever possible. Hence education has almost always put its first efforts into cultivating the reasonable portion of the mind rather than the imaginative or emotional. Furthermore, the strength and accessibility of imaginative and emotional responses is so great in spite of education that though men seldom make effective reasonable decisions without the help of emotion, they often make, or appear to make, effective emotional decisions without the help of rational processes or the modification of reasonable consideration. Inevitably, therefore, the available reason in rhetorical situations will vary tremendously, and the assistance which imagination must provide towards the moving of the will must vary accordingly. Except in Swift's unexciting land of the Houyhnhnms, however, imagination will always be there.

Ever since men first began to weave the web of words to charm their fellows, they have known that some men can impose their wills on others through language in despite of reason. Almost as long, other men have deplored and feared this talent. If the talent were wholly a matter of divine gift and were wholly unexplainable, the only alternative to succumbing to the orator would be to kill him. In time it appeared, however, that this skill could be learned, in part at least, and could be analyzed. Thus if it were good, men could learn to develop it further; and if it were bad, they could be armed in some measure against it. Hence rhetoric, and hence the partial rhetoric of anti-reason and pseudo-reason. And hence the appeal of such rhetorical eruptions as Aldous Huxley's total condemnation of oratory in *The Devils of Loudon*.[22] His indictment of public speakers is indeed skillful, and ought to be taken seriously. If the talent of his golden-voiced Grandiers be indeed magic, then we will have to agree that the fate of man before such wizards is hopeless. Rhetoric teaches, however, that the method and the power of this kind of discourse can be analyzed, at least in large part, and if its subtleties cannot be wholly *learned* by every ambitious speaker, the characteristics of its operation can be understood, and if understood, then controlled, for better or for worse.[23]

The oratory which Huxley would extirpate presents a rewarding approach to the rhetoric of advertising and propaganda, of which it is the historic prototype. In them the techniques of suggestion, reiteration, imaginative substitution, verbal irrelevance and indirection, and emotional and pseudological bullying have been developed beyond, one might hazard a guess, the fondest dreams of the sophists and the historic demagogues. This development does not represent a change in intention from them to our contemporaries, but an advance in knowledge and opportunity and media.

If you have a soap or a cigarette or a social order for quick, profitable sale, you do not neglect any method within your ethical system of making that sale. That is the paramount problem of the advertiser and the propagandist, and their solutions are very much alike. They are rhetorical solutions, at their best very carefully gauged to the mass audi-

[22] (New York, 1952), pp. 18-19.

[23] Observe the tradition of rhetoric as a systematic study, summarized in my "Aspects of Rhetorical Tradition," *QJS*, XXXVI (April 1950), 169-172.

ence, adapted to special audiences, and varying basically only as the initial sale or the permanent customer is the principal object. What advertising is in commerce, propaganda is in politics, especially international politics. Neither scorns reason or the likeness of reason, the rhetoric of information and logical argument, if the message and the audience seem to make that the best or only means to the sale. Neither, on the other hand, prefers that method to the shorter, quicker ways to unconsidered action. They concentrate—forcibly where possible, rhetorically where necessary—on the exclusion of competing ideas, on the short-circuiting or by-passing of informed judgment. By preference they do not seek to balance or overbalance alternative ideas or courses of action; they seek to obliterate them, to circumvent or subvert the rational processes which tend to make men weigh and consider. As Adlai Stevenson said, slogans, the common staple of advertising and propaganda, "are normally designed to get action without reflection."

That advertising should enjoy a happier reputation than propaganda in a competitive, commercial-industrial nation such as the United States, which is only just now learning the term *psychological warfare*, is not to be wondered at. We do not have a public service institution for the defensive analysis of advertising, like the Institute of Propaganda Analysis, which assumed that propaganda is something from which we must learn to protect ourselves. The ethical superiority of our advertising is no doubt a compliment to our dominant business code—and to our laws. Still, if one wishes to know what the ungoverned rhetoric of advertising can be, he may get a suggestion by listening to some of what is beamed to us from certain radio stations south of the border.

The kinship of advertising and salesmanship, and their somewhat denatured relatives "public relations" and "promotion," to conventional public address, the established vehicle of rhetoric, may be embarrassing at times, but it must be acknowledged. The family resemblance is too strong to be ignored and too important to be denied. The omnipresence of the rhetoric of advertising, as I have suggested, gives it a standing which must be reckoned with, no matter what opinion the student of public address may hold of it. The rhetoric of public address, in this country at least, must function, whether or no, in a public mind which is steeped in the rhetoric of advertising, a rhetoric whose dominating principles must be recognized as adaptations of a portion of the fundamentals of any rhetoric. One need only compare a textbook or handbook of advertising methods with standard, conventional rhetorics—textbooks in public speaking and persuasion—especially in the handling of such topics as interest, suggestion, and motivation, to be convinced of the coincidence of method if not of philosophic outlook. Many times in adult evening classes in public speaking, have I heard speeches on the secrets of successful salesmanship, and as often have I found myself being offered a more or a less competent parody of certain portions of our textbook, which for some reason the student had omitted to read. Not by mere chance, one must confess, does the non-academic public take great interest in the four "miracle" courses to be found among the offerings of many universities—advertising, salesmanship, psychology, and effective speaking. Nor is it remarkable, though one may think it deplorable, that appearances of the officers of our national government before the mass audience of the citizens are characteristic products of the country's leading advertising agencies.

Likewise propaganda and its brother

"information" borrow and refine upon certain portions of rhetoric. No doubt it serves a useful purpose to identify propaganda with the vicious forces in the modern world, with the German Government of World War I and with the Nazi and Soviet totalitarianisms of the present time. At the same time, however, it would be the better part of wisdom to recognize that most of the major techniques of this propaganda are long-known rhetorical techniques gone wrong, that propaganda is not a new invention which we have no ready equipment for combatting, let alone fumigating and using for our honorable ends. The understanding of propaganda will be founded in the understanding of rhetoric first of all, whatever else may be necessary.[24] Both Ross Scanlan and Kenneth Burke have demonstrated the enlightenment which can come from the application of rhetorical criticism to both the internal and external propaganda of the Nazis;[25] and two articles by Scanlan and Henry C. Youngerman in the first issue of *Today's Speech* (April, 1953) are grounded on the assumption of a close kinship between rhetoric (or its corollary, "public address") and propaganda.[26] In fact, one of Scanlan's concluding statements indirectly makes both the identification and the basic distinction: "Today it is to be hoped that America will find means to match enemy propaganda in effectiveness without sacrificing the standards of morality and intellect that distinguish democracy from the totalitarian order."

[24] See, for example, Everett L. Hunt, "Ancient Rhetoric and Modern Propaganda," *QJS*, XXXVII (April 1951), 157-160.

[25] Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (1941), pp. 191-220; Scanlan, "The Nazi Party Speaker System, I & II," *SM*, XVI (August 1949), 82-97, XVII (June 1950), 134-148; "The Nazi Rhetorician," *QJS*, XXVII (December 1951), 430-440.

[26] "Two Views of Propaganda," pp. 13-14; "Propaganda and Public Address," pp. 15-17.

Rhetoric as a Method of Inquiry

More than once in the preceding pages I have in passing assigned to rhetoric a secondary function of the discovery of ideas, contributory to its prime function of the popularizing of ideas. That is the consequence of the division of *inventio*, the term applied in Roman rhetoric to the systematic investigative procedures by which rhetoric sought to turn up all the relevant arguments or considerations in any given situation. As part of *inventio*, for example, the elaborate doctrine of *status* was developed, through which by the application of analytical criteria it was possible to determine just what was the core, the central issue in any given case, just what had to be proved as a *sine qua non*, and where the lines of argument for proving it would lie if they were available. In general the division of *inventio* constituted a codification of the *topoi* or *places where arguments are to be found;* for instance, in *fact past, fact future, more and less, etc.* Rhetoric, thus, as we have said, provides scientific assistance to the speaker in discovering what questions to ask and how to go about answering them. It serves the speaker as laboratory procedures for analysis serve the chemist—by systematic inventory it enables him to determine with reasonable completeness what is present and what is absent in any given case.

We need not be surprised, therefore, that so useful a method tended to be incorporated into other arts and sciences where its original provenience was often forgotten. Historically, some of the studies to profit greatly from this borrowing from rhetoric have been the law, theology, logic, and poetic.[27] The Po-

[27] See Richard McKeon, "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," *Critics and Criticism, Ancient and Modern*, ed. R. S. Crane (Chicago, 1952), pp. 260-296, reprinted from *Speculum*, January, 1942; and Marvin T. Herrick, "The Place of Rhetoric in Poetic Theory," *QJS*, XXXIV (February 1948), 1-22.

landizing of rhetoric, one of the characteristic phenomena of its history, accounts in large part for the splinter meanings and the distortions which we have seen as typical of its current and historic significance. It has been the fate of rhetoric, the residual term, to be applied to the less intellectual segments of itself, while its central operating division, *inventio*, has been appropriated by the studies and sciences which rhetoric serves.

The functions of a complete rhetoric, however, have usually been operative under whatever temporary auspices as the whole art of discourse, even as they were in the renaissance tripartite grammar-logic-rhetoric. This splintering may go so far towards specialism, however, that the investigative function of rhetoric, the method of *inventio*, may be diverted from that to which it most properly applies. This diversion may very well be the tendency today, where a complete rhetoric hardly exists as a formal discipline except in those classically oriented courses in public speaking, debate, group discussion, argumentation, and persuasion whose central focus is on *inventio*—the investigation and discovery of lines of argument and basic issues. Mostly rhetoric today survives, as we have seen, under other names and special applications in those specialties which contribute to it or draw upon it or appropriate selectively from its store of method—psychology, advertising, salesmanship, propaganda analysis, public opinion and social control, semantics, and that which is loosely called "research" in common parlance.

May I attempt in summary of this matter to bring rhetoric back to its essential investigative function, its function of discovery, by quoting from Isocrates, the Athenian politico-rhetorical philosopher, and from Edmund Burke, the eighteenth-century British statesman-orator? Wrote Isocrates in the *Antidosis*, "With this faculty we both contend against others on matters that are open to dispute and seek light for ourselves on things which are unknown; for the same arguments which we use in persuading others when we speak in public, we employ when we deliberate in our thoughts."[28] Twenty-two centuries later, the young Burke included in his notebook digest of the topics of rhetoric, which he headed "How to Argue," the following succinct, Baconian statement about the functions of *inventio:*

> To invent Arguments without a thorough knowledge of the Subject is clearly impossible. But the Art of Invention does two things—
> 1. It suggests to us more readily those Parts of our actual knowledge which may help towards illustrating the matter before us, &
> 2. It suggests to us heads of Examination which may lead, if pursued with effect into a knowledge of the Subject.
>
> So that the Art of Invention may properly be considered as the method of calling up what we do know, & investigating that of which we are ignorant.[29]

Rhetoric in Education

If the burden of the preceding pages is not misplaced, the importance of rhetoric in the equipment of the well-educated member of society can hardly be in doubt. I am not inclined, therefore, especially in this journal, to offer to demonstrate the desirability of speech as an academic study. Our conventions and our journals have been full of such demonstration for, lo, these thirty years.[30] If enlightened and responsible leaders with rhetorical knowledge and skill are not trained and nurtured, irresponsible demagogues will monop-

[28] *Isocrates*, trans. George Norlin (Loeb Classical Library, New York, 1929), II, 327.

[29] From an original manuscript among the Wentworth-Fitzwilliam papers in the Sheffield City Library, used with the kind permission of Earl Fitzwilliam and the trustees of the Fitzwilliam settled estates.

[30] See, for example, one of the latest, W. N. Brigance, "General Education in an Industrial Free Society," *QJS*, XXXVIII (April 1952), esp. p. 181.

olize the power of rhetoric, will have things to themselves. If talk rather than take is to settle the course of our society, if ballots instead of bullets are to effect our choice of governors, if discourse rather than coercion is to prevail in the conduct of human affairs, it would seem like arrant folly to trust to chance that the right people shall be equipped offensively and defensively with a sound rationale of informative and suasory discourse.

In general education, especially, rhetoric would appear to deserve a place of uncommon importance. That is the burden of a recent article by Dean Hunt of Swarthmore. Rhetoric is the organon of the liberal studies, the formulation of the principles through which the educated man, the possessor of many specialties, attains effectiveness in society.[31] A complete rhetoric is a structure for the wholeness of the effective man, the aim of general education. But, as Dean Hunt concludes, the rhetorician himself must not become a technical specialist:

> He will keep his wholeness if he comes back again and again to Aristotle, but he must supplement those conceptions with what modern scientists have added to the mirror for man; he must illuminate the classical rhetoric with psychology, cultural anthropology, linguistics and semantics, special disciplines, perhaps, but disciplines in which he can lean heavily on interpreters who speak to others than their professional colleagues. Departments of speech which have emphasized training in rhetoric have a new opportunity to establish their place in general education. Their very claim to wholeness has been a source of distrust in an atmosphere of specialism. If now they can relate themselves to newer conceptions in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities, they can show that the ideal of the good man skilled in speaking is like the sea, ever changing and ever the same.[32]

So much for rhetoric in education as a study directed at the creation and at the analysis and criticism of informative and suasory discourse—at the ability, on the one hand, "to summon thought quickly and use it forcibly,"[33] and on the other to listen or read critically with the maximum application of analytical judgment.

Rhetoric would appear thus to be in certain senses a literary study, or as Wichelns wrote, at least "its tools are those of literature." It is a literary study as it is involved in the creative arts of language, of informing ideas. It is a literary study also as it contributes substantially to literary scholarship. Not only have literature and literary theory been persistently rhetorical for long periods—during much of the renaissance, for example, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in England, and for most of the short history of American literature—but writers and readers until fairly recently had been so generally educated in rhetoric that it provided the vocabulary and many of the concepts in terms of which much literature was both written and read. Clark's *Milton at St. Paul's School* may be cited as one conclusive demonstration of the importance of rhetoric in renaissance education and its importance in renaissance literature. This importance is now being recognized by literary scholars, and rhetoric is taking on considerable proportions in their studies, especially among those who are studying the renaissance. Myrick's study of Sir Philip Sidney as a literary craftsman,[34] for example, demonstrates how thoroughly Sidney was schooled in rhetoric and how carefully he constructed his defense of poetry on familiar rhetorical principles. If Myrick has been in error in his construction of the specific genealogy of Sidney's rhet-

[31] "Rhetoric and General Education," *QJS*, XXXV (October 1949), 275, 277.
[32] *Ibid.*, 279.
[33] Herbert A. Wichelns, "Public Speaking and Dramatic Arts," in *On Going to College: A Symposium* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1938), p. 240.
[34] Kenneth O. Myrick, *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (1935).

oric, the fact of Sidney's rhetorical system is nevertheless in no doubt.

The plain truth is that whatever the inadequacies in specific cases of the analytical method ingrained in our educated ancestors, they *had* method, the method of formal rhetoric; whereas a general characteristic of our contemporary education is that it inculcates *no* method beyond a rather uncertain grammar and a few rules of paragraphing and bibliography. Rigidity of method is doubtless a grievous obstacle to the greatest fulfillment of genius in either belles lettres or public address; but the widespread impotence and ineptitude even of our best-educated fellows when faced with the problem of constructing or analyzing any but the most rudimentary expository or argumentative discourse, much less a complicated literary work, are surely worse. Rhetoric supplies the equipment for such practical endeavor in the promulgation of ideas, and twenty centuries have learned to use it to supplement and perfect chance and natural instinct.

That such method has at times become sterile or mechanical, that at other times it has been put to uses for which it was least adapted is amusing, perhaps lamentable, but not surprising. The remote uses to which rhetorical methods of analysis and description have been put, in the absence of a more appropriate method, are well illustrated by the following passage from Sir John Hawkins' *History of Music,* first published in the late eighteenth century:

> The art of invention is made one of the heads among the precepts of rhetoric, to which music in this and sundry instances bears a near resemblance; the end of persuasion, or affecting the passions being common to both. This faculty consists in the enumeration of common places, which are revolved over in the mind, and requires both an ample store of knowledge in the subject upon which it is exercised, and a power of applying that knowledge as occasion may require. It differs from memory in this respect, that whereas memory does but recall to the mind the images or remembrance of things as they were first perceived, the faculty of invention divides complex ideas into those whereof they are composed, and recommends them again after different fashions, thereby creating variety of new objects and conceptions. Now, the greater the fund of knowledge above spoken of is, the greater is the source from whence the invention of the artist or composer is supplied; and the benefits thereof are seen in new combinations and phrases, capable of variety and permutation without end.[35]

From its lapses and wanderings, however, rhetoric when needed has almost always recovered its vitality and comprehensive scope, by reference to its classic sources. But that it should be ignored seems, as Dean Hunt suggests, hardly a compliment to education.

Rhetoric as a serious scholarly study I have treated in my former essay, and I shall not go over the same ground again. That there is a body of philosophy and principle worth scholarly effort in discovery, enlargement, and reinterpretation is beyond question, and fortunately more competent scholars each year are working at it. Rhetorical criticism and the study of rhetoric as a revealing social and cultural phenomenon are also gaining ground. New and interesting directions for research in these areas are being explored, or at least marked out; they are based on newly developed techniques and hitherto neglected kinds of data. One might mention, for example, those new approaches listed by Maloney:[36] the quantitative content analysis as developed by Lasswell; the qualitative content analysis as used by Lowenthal and Guterman; figurative analysis such as applied to Shakespeare by Caroline Spurgeon; and intonational analysis. Extensive and provocative suggestions are to be found in quantity in the text and bibliography of Brembeck and Howell's

[35] (2 vols., London, 1875), I, xxv.

[36] "Some New Directions in Rhetorical Criticism," *Central States Speech Journal,* IV (February 1953), 1-5.

Persuasion: A Means of Social Control,[37] especially in Part VI. Lucrative also are the new attempts at the analysis of the rhetoric of historical movements, such as Griffin's study of the rhetoric of the anti-masonic movement and others under way within the Speech Association of America. Elsewhere in this issue Thonssen's review of recent rhetorical studies illustrates amply both the new and the traditional in rhetorical scholarship; and the section on rhetoric in the annual Haberman bibliography is convincing evidence of the vitality of current enterprise.[38]

Though new avenues, new techniques, new materials such as the foregoing are inviting to the increasing numbers of scholars whose interests and abilities—to say nothing of their necessities—lie in rhetorical research, especially those new directions which lead to rhetoric as a cultural, a sociological, a social-psychiatric phenomenon, the older literary-historical-political studies are still neither too complete nor too good. In any event, each new generation probably needs to interpret afresh much of the relevant history of thought, especially the thought of the people as distinguished from what is commonly considered the history of ideas. For this the scholarship of rhetoric seems particularly adapted. Towards this purpose, I find no need to relocate the field of rhetorical scholarship as envisioned by Hudson and Wichelns, nor to recant from the considerations which I outlined in the *QJS* in 1937.[39] One may find it reassuring to observe, however, that much which was asked for in those essays has since then been undertaken and often accomplished with considerable success. Especially is this true of the study of public address in its bulk and day-to-day manifestations: in the movement studies, the "case" studies, the sectional and regional studies, the studies of "debates" and "campaigns" such as the debates on the League of Nations and the campaigns for conservation.

There remains much to do, nevertheless, and much to re-do in the more familiar and conventional areas of research and interpretation. The editing and translation of rhetorical texts is still far from complete or adequate. The canon of ancient rhetoric is, to be sure, in very good shape, and when Caplan's translation of the *Ad Herennium* is published in the Loeb Library there will hardly be a major deficiency. In post-classical, mediaeval, and renaissance rhetoric the situation is not so good, though it is improving. There are still too few works like Howell's *Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne* and Sister Therese Sullivan's commentary on and translation of the fourth book of St. Augustine's *De Doctrina*. Halm's *Rhetores Minores*, for example, is substantially unmolested so far.

English and continental rhetoric of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries is slowly appearing in modern editions by scholars who know rhetoric as the theory of public address. Our bibliographies show increasing numbers of these as doctoral dissertations, most of which, alas, seem to be abandoned almost as soon as finished. Only a few works of the sort, like Howell's *Fénelon*, represent mature, published work.

In the history and historical analysis of rhetoric, nothing of adequate range and scope yet exists. Thonssen and Baird's *Speech Criticism*, ambitious as it is, is only a beginning. The general history of rhetoric, and even most of the special histories, have yet to be written. Works now under way by Donald L.

[37] (New York, 1952).

[38] "A Bibliography of Rhetoric and Public Address," ed. F. W. Haberman, formerly appearing annually in the *QJS*, latterly in *SM*.

[39] See above, note 1.

Clark and Wilbur S. Howell will make substantial contributions, but rhetoric from Corax to Whately needs far fuller and better treatment than it gets in the series of histories of criticism by the late J. W. H. Atkins.

Towards the study of the rhetorical principles and practice of individual speakers and writers the major part of our scholarly effort seems to have been directed. The convenience of this kind of study is beyond question and is hard to resist, either in public address or in literature. And this is as it should be. The tendency to write biographies of speakers, however, rather than rhetorico-critical studies of them, must be kept in check, or at least in proportion. Again for reasons of convenience, if not also of scholarly nationalism, the studies of American speakers are proportionately too numerous. British and foreign public address is still far too scantily noticed by competent rhetorical scholars.

Rhetoric and Poetic

This would not be the place, I think, even if Professor Thonssen's review of rhetorical works were not appearing in this same issue of the *QJS*, for a survey of rhetorical scholarship. The preceding paragraphs are intended only as a token of decent respect to accomplishment and progress in a discrete and important branch of humane scholarship. A further area where rhetorical scholarship may be very profitably pursued, however, perhaps deserves some special consideration.

Even if it were not for the contributions of Kenneth Burke, the study of rhetoric in literature and of the relation of the theory of rhetoric to the theory of poetic would be taking on renewed importance at the present time. The lively revival of rhetorical study in renaissance scholarship which I have mentioned is only one phase of the problem. A renewed or increased interest in satire, deriving in part, perhaps, from the excellent work which of late has been done on Swift, leads directly to rhetoric. The rhetorical mode is obviously at the center of satire, and any fundamental analysis of satire must depend upon the equipment for rhetorical analysis. Likewise a complete dramatic criticism must draw upon rhetoric, both practically and philosophically. The internal rhetoric of the drama was specifically recognized by Aristotle when he referred readers of the *Poetics* to the *Rhetoric* for coverage of the element of *dianoia*, for the analysis of speeches in which agents try to convince or persuade each other. What, however, is the external rhetoric of the drama? What is the drama intended to do to an audience? Herein lies the question of the province of poetic as opposed to the province of rhetoric. When Antony addresses the Roman citizens in *Julius Caesar*, the existence of an internal rhetoric in the play is clear enough: the relation between Antony and his stage audience is unmistakably rhetorical. But what of the relation between Antony and the audience in the pit, or the Antony-stage-audience combination and the audience in the pit? The more we speculate about the effect of a play or any literary work on an audience, the more we become involved in metaphysical questions in which rhetoric must be involved.

Much contemporary poetry or pseudo-poetry in any generation is rhetorical in the most obvious sense—in the same sense as the epideictic oration. It "pleases" largely by rhetorical means or methods. It "reminds" us of experience instead of "organizing" or "creating" experience. It appeals to our satisfaction with what we are used to; it convinces us that what *was* still may be as it was, that old formulas are pleasantest if not best. It is not so much concerned with pointing up the old elements in the

new, even, as establishing the identity of the old and the contemporary. "What oft was thought, but ne'er so well expressed" is a distinctly rhetorical attainment, and it would not have occurred to Pope to suppose that the poetic and the rhetorical were antithetical, if indeed they were separable. Though sporadically the effort of critics and theorists has been to keep *rhetoric* and *poetic* apart, the two rationales have had an irresistible tendency to come together, and their similarities may well be more important than their differences. When the forming of attitude is admitted into the province of rhetoric, then, to Kenneth Burke, rhetoric becomes a method for the analysis of even lyric poetry. Hence a frequent term in certain kinds of literary analysis now is *poetic-rhetoric*, as for example in the first two sentences in Ruth Wallerstein's analysis of two elegies: "I want this paper to consider two poems, John Donne's elegy on Prince Henry and Milton's *Lycidas*, in the light that is shed on them by seventeenth-century rhetoric-poetic as I understand it. Both the significance of that rhetoric and the test of my view of it will reside in its power to illuminate the poems."[40]

Undoubtedly there are basic differences between *poetic* and *rhetoric*, both practical and philosophical, and probably these differences lie both in the kind of method which is the proper concern of each and the kind of effect on audiences to the study of which each is devoted. The purely poetic seeks the creation or organization of imaginative experience, probably providing for reader or audience some kind of satisfying spiritual or emotional therapy. The rhetorical seeks a predetermined channeling of the audience's understanding or attitude. Poetry works by representation; rhetoric by instigation. The poetic is fulfilled in creation, the rhetorical in illumination. "An image," wrote Longinus, "has one purpose with the orators and another with the poets; . . . the design of the poetic image is enthralment, of the rhetorical, vivid description. Both, however, seek to stir the passions and the emotions. . . . In oratorical imagery its best feature is always its reality and truth."[41] Poetry, declared Sir Philip Sidney, cannot lie because it affirms nothing; it merely presents. Rhetoric not only presents but affirms. That is its characteristic. Both poetic and rhetoric attain their effects through language. If the poet's highest skill lies in his power to make language do what it has never done before, to force from words and the conjunction of words meanings which are new and unique, perhaps it is the highest skill of the speaker to use words in their accepted senses in such a way as to make them carry their traditional meanings with a vividness and effectiveness which they have never known before.

Summary

In brief we may assign to rhetoric a four-fold status. So far as it is concerned with the management of discourse in specific situations for practical purposes, it is an instrumental discipline. It is a literary study, involving linguistics, critical theory, and semantics as it touches the art of informing ideas, and the functioning of language. It is a philosophical study so far as it is concerned with a method of investigation or inquiry. And finally, as it is akin to politics, drawing upon psychology and sociology, rhetoric is a social study, the study of a major force in the behavior of men in society.

[40] "Rhetoric in the English Renaissance: Two Elegies," *English Institute Essays, 1948*, p. 153.

[41] Trans. Rhys Roberts, sec. 15.

GRAMMAR AND RHETORIC: THE TEACHER'S PROBLEM

Donald Davidson

THE title of my paper is perhaps a little more non-committal than I would wish. In our time, the conjunction *and* has too often been the mark of a timid evasiveness in which I do not mean to indulge. "He was an old man who fished alone . . . ," writes Ernest Hemingway, "*and* he had gone eighty-four days now without taking a fish."[1] The philosophy of Hemingway, as man and writer, is latent in that characteristic conjunction *and*. It bothers Mr. Hemingway to think that there may be some relationship between objects other than a simple coupling. "A" and "B" are there. The inescapable act of vision tells him so. But Hemingway rarely ventures, through grammar and rhetoric, to go beyond saying that "A" and "B" are just there, together. Similarly, our diplomats and Far Eastern Experts long had a habit of declaring that there was a Red Russia *and* a Red China, with the tender implication that such a conjunction was entirely innocent. Political theorists for nearly two centuries have coordinated liberty *and* equality, but have too often failed to tell us, as history clearly shows, that liberty and equality are much more hostile than they are mutually friendly; that the prevalence of liberty may very well require some subordination of the principle of equality; or, on the other hand, that enforcement of equality by legal and governmental devices may be quite destructive to the principle of liberty.

So long as the teacher says, non-committally: "There is grammar" in one category, and "There is rhetoric" in quite another and entirely separate category, the teacher's problem will remain a problem which he can confront only with makeshift solutions.

A fundamental and thorough solution is possible, I believe, only if we abandon the rather prevalent idea that grammar and rhetoric are merely coordinate and have no relationship beyond mere coordination. The two are of course separate, so far as they are different aspects of the act of writing or speaking. And certainly one must be temporarily isolated from the other for purposes of study. I like Mr. Richard Weaver's conception of grammar "as a system of forms of public speech."[2] There may be such a thing as a private rhetoric, and some may think that the rhetoric of certain modern writers is indeed a very private rhetoric; but there is no such thing as private grammar. In all but its minor and moot points, grammar is shaped by public action, it is pub-

Mr. Davidson (A.B., Vanderbilt, 1917, A.M., 1922, Vanderbilt; D.Litt., 1948, Washington & Lee) is Professor of English at Vanderbilt University. For many years he has served as a member of the faculty of the Bread Loaf School of English. Well known as a writer and critic, he is the author of a number of books including American Composition and Rhetoric. *The paper presented here was read at a conference on the improvement of the teaching of writing and speaking sponsored jointly by the University of Missouri and the Carnegie Fund for the Advancement of Teaching. The conference was held on the campus of the University of Missouri, October 9 and 10, 1953.*

[1] Ernest Hemingway, *The Old Man and the Sea* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. 9.

[2] Richard M. Weaver, *The Ethics of Rhetoric* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953), p. 115.

lic property, and it must be mastered by anyone who attempts public utterance, whether he is composing a message to Congress or merely ordering a dish of ice-cream. Rhetoric also has a public character, but it is freer in action than grammar and far more diverse and individual in its patterns, although these patterns are not without their own kind of formalization. Grammar may restrain rhetoric, and does in fact restrain it; but rhetoric, in turn, exerts some "counter-pressure" on grammar. Language, as Mr. Weaver says:

> is not a purely passive instrument . . . while you are doing something with it, it is doing something with you, or with your intention. It does not exactly fight back; rather it has a set of postures and balances which somehow modify your thrusts and holds. The sentence form is certainly one of these. You pour into it your meaning, and it deflects and molds into certain shapes. The user of language must know how this counterpressure can be turned to the advantage of his general purpose. The failure of those who are careless, or insensitive to the rhetoric of grammar is that they allow the counter force to impede their design, whereas a perspicacious use of it will forward the design.[3]

With Mr. Weaver I would hold that the combination of grammar and rhetoric in the finished composition or utterance should be one of the principal ends toward which our teaching should move. To keep grammar and rhetoric separate, or to link them only casually, without real thought about their relationship, means that we are certain to foster bad grammar and weak rhetoric. It is the teaching of grammar as rhetoric, or of rhetoric as grammar, that I propose to discuss.

Forty years ago a textbook like Woolley's *Handbook of Composition* assumed that a college freshman needed little instruction in grammar as such, or even in the more obvious points of rhetoric. The college freshman of those days had absorbed those subjects, without realizing it, in the strict classical education which was then a prerequisite to college studies. A college freshman who had struggled with the periods of Cicero's *Orations* or the passages in indirect discourse in Caesar's *Commentaries* knew more about accidence, syntax, and rhetorical patterns than most graduate students know today. He had also probably read Xenophon and Homer in the original Greek, and at various levels in his schooling had been inexorably drilled in the parts of speech, had parsed sentences, perhaps also had diagrammed sentences. From his first entrance into school he had been obliged to recite aloud in every class, and to read aloud from reasonably well-selected classics from English and American literature. He had also stood at the blackboard, facing his teacher and schoolmates, and had demonstrated the propositions of Euclid—a wonderful discipline in clarity and form of expression. Grammar and rhetoric were thus interfused with his entire educational experience, and he was further fortified by the informal education he was constantly receiving in his family circle, in his church, or at public meetings. Therefore Woolley's *Handbook* was not a book of instruction, but a reference book to be used in the theme-writing courses which were then being newly introduced into college work.

But the vast increase in the school and college population, accompanied by the decline of classical studies and by radical changes in the curriculum of the secondary schools, soon destroyed the assumptions on which such a manual of reference as Woolley's *Handbook* had been built. Later manuals, although they seemed at first to follow the example of Woolley, are actually a quite dif-

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 116.

ferent kind of textbook. They are tools of correction, designed for the use of the harried teacher who must somehow mark and grade his 100 themes, received on Tuesday, and make them ready for return by Saturday, or at any rate before the next batch of 100 or more themes appears. The new handbooks and still newer work-books emphasize "common errors" of grammar, punctuation, and usage, but provide little more than a sketchy instruction in such matters, and even less in the broad principles of rhetoric. They are in fact administrative devices rather than true instruments of education, since they offer a simple and plausible means of organizing uniform systems of correction, grading, and record-keeping for large mobs of students, most of whom are reluctant members of the English composition class. I am not here undertaking to condemn the handbook as a type of textbook. I merely point to it as a symptomatic indication of a trouble that we have fallen into.

At this point I note two other tendencies, both of which represent rebellions against the merely corrective emphasis of current handbooks and systems of theme-handling.

One is the rebellion of the liberal or realistic school of grammarians—of whom Professor Charles C. Fries is a notable example. The liberal grammarians contend, in general, that the grammar and usage taught in current handbooks is a grammar and usage found between the covers of freshman college (or high school) manuals—and nowhere else on earth. This is what Mr. Fries is talking about when he speaks, in his *American English Grammar*,[4] of the "make-believe correctness" which school authorities have fostered, under the illusion that they are teaching "good English." The liberal school of grammatical rebels support their contentions by a systematic array of examples and statistical tables. They can furthermore claim that their views are in line with the studies of Jespersen, Krapp, and other authorities. But it should be noted that the new grammar of the liberal grammarians is grammar in isolation, in a state of abstraction—a bundle of knowledge which has no acknowledged connection with the art of rhetoric.

The other group of rebels are the teachers—largely though not exclusively of the younger generation—who have become interested in the art of writing. Very often they may be teachers who during their college years took courses in creative writing. At any rate they have felt in one way or another the fascination and power of literature as an art. To their teaching they bring the viewpoint of the practicing artist and writer rather than merely the viewpoint of the historical scholar or literary interpreter. Somewhere or other, directly or indirectly, they have encountered the influence of the Kenyon School of English, or of the Bread Loaf School of English of Middlebury College; or they have sat in the classes of those various notable teachers who are themselves literary artists—like Warren Beck of Lawrence College, Theodore Morrison of Harvard, Hudson Strode of Alabama, Paul Engle of Iowa, Andrew Lytle of Florida, Allen Tate of Minnesota, Robert P. Warren of Yale—to name but a few. Through these teachers the influence of the writing courses, of the numerous and popular writers' conferences, and above all of our rich and intense contemporary literature has sifted down to the freshman composition course.

These young teachers, scattered throughout the country, will undoubt-

[4] Charles Carpenter Fries, *American English Grammar* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1940).

edly constitute, at present, a minority in the average department of English, and therefore, if political terms were proper, could be called a "loyal opposition." But in other terms, they are apostles of rhetoric, who as teachers are discontented with mechanical systems of correction. Although they are a minority, they make their influence felt in the choice of textbooks and in the content and tone of the composition course. And naturally, in their own classes—since teachers always want to teach what they themselves have been taught—they will manage somehow or other to convey their own enthusiasm for writing as an art, even if that art has to be bootlegged past barriers of mimeographed syllabi, punch-holed proficiency tests, and soulless grading machines.

These rebel teachers of the new generation, though not disdainful of grammar and usage, would not, I think, accept Mr. Fries's emphasis on mere observation of *actual* usage as the basis of a language program. The mere study of usage—even if that study is liberalized, made realistic, made scientific as Mr. Fries wishes—will not of itself lead to good writing. In fact, it is to be suspected that the undiscriminative nose-counting of the Fries school of thought is hardly more, after all, than a thoroughgoing extension of the hit-and-miss methods of the handbooks. It enlarges the area of grammatical correctness without ever saying what is to be done with the larger correctness thus obtained. If the handbooks teach a petty kind of schoolmarm English, the new school of grammarians offers nothing really different in kind. It is just a bigger and looser kind of schoolmarm English. And we will not keep it from becoming a schoolmarm English by calling it, in solemn academic terms, a *language program*. What the rebel teachers are interested in is not knowledge alone, but knowledge applied, and skill attained. They would perhaps ask: "If the textbooks of Messrs. Warren and Brooks, such as *Understanding Poetry*, can revolutionize the teaching of literature, why can we not bring about at least a few modest changes in the teaching of writing? And if we attempt that, we shall have to bring grammar and rhetoric together."

I have put these words into the mouths of the rebel teachers—teachers younger than I am, teachers that I have known, in various parts of the United States. But you will have no doubt, I trust, where my inclination lies. I do not hesitate to say that I am on the side of the rebel teachers.

At the same time I know—and if they do not know it, they will soon find out—that it is not an easy matter, and perhaps it is a somewhat dangerous matter to introduce the average freshman student to the intricacies of the New Criticism; and that Faulkner and Warren, exciting though they may be in style and method, must be handled with care if they are to be packaged for freshman composition courses, and are not, after all, the only good available models for the exemplification of the art of rhetoric.

We are caught, you now see, in something of a trap. The sheer massiveness of the school and college population forces us, to some extent, to treat the writing course as an administrative rather than an educational problem. If we surrender to that pressure, we soon find ourselves tied up in the red tape and paper work that go with administration. Then the composition teachers become a kind of bureaucracy which like any other bureaucracy is more concerned with formulas than with fruitful results. Under such a regime we may possibly condition our 500 or our 3000 composition students into some feeble

awareness of the horrors of the dangling participle and the comma splice, but they will remain innocent of grammar, in the full sense, awkward in rhetoric, and perfectly ignorant of any connection between grammar and rhetoric.

Mr. Fries and his supporters with justice condemn the kind of grammatical knowledge and grammatical practice that emerges from such teaching. But if we are content to accept their very special advice, and go no further, we get, at best, only a "language program"—that is, a slightly revised version of the old grammar, and little else. I could imagine a product of such a language program as highly eligible for an "Information, Please" or a "Quiz Kid" performance. But if this student had had the language program, and nothing more, I would not believe that his written or spoken prose would have any more clarity or impressiveness than a product of the handbook-mechanical correction school of teaching. There is nothing in a "language program" that will give a student the grace, fire, persuasiveness, salt, or beauty that belong to the art of rhetoric.

But if we turn for counsel to the apostles of the art of rhetoric, we are once more daunted by familiar obstacles. The handbooks claim to be "practical." The new grammarians declare that their grammar is "scientific." There is a popular American myth about art, which holds that art is something insubstantial, filmy, and queer. "Art," in comparison with the practical or the scientific, has a low prestige value. Do we dare speak of writing as an art to the son of the business executive, to the daughter of the dairy farmer, to the prospective engineer, or psychologist, or doctor, or bacteriologist?

Yes, I believe that is exactly what we must dare to do if we wish to gain true respect from our students. To those students, it may well be, the practical, the scientific, the utilitarian are old stories, made tedious by repetition. They come to us in college already worn-out with punch-sheets, intelligence tests, projects, mechanical systems of all sorts, and I believe they are much more ready to respond to the high and ambitious claims of art than college students for many generations have been.

Whatever their state of mind and interest, our obligation is plain. If the writing course is to be an educational course, and not some loose, rather cheating sort of conditioning process, we owe it to our students to restore to it the educational content that it so notably has lost. And we cannot honestly call it an educational course unless we make it a course in the attainment of that skill in composition which is nothing less than the art of rhetoric. But we cannot, in turn, teach skill in composition unless we can contrive to end the sad divorce of grammar and rhetoric that is the root of our teaching trouble.

We need a method of teaching and a method of study that will bring grammar and rhetoric together. It is such a method that I now propose to illustrate. I admit that the general problem has many aspects, the importance of which I would never deny. But it seems best, by way of illustration, to deal here only with the problem of grammar in connection with rhetoric, for it is central, and I doubt if other problems can be solved until the relationship between grammar and rhetoric is understood.

In his new textbook—*American English: A Twentieth Century Grammar*—Mr. L. P. Myers offers us a simple sentence: "John went home," and says, in effect, that the noun *home* might as well be called the direct object of the

verb *went*.[5] If you and I insist on saying that *home* is "an adverbial objective," Mr. Myers asserts that we do so only because the ghost of Latin grammar is peeking over the transom. Actually, says Mr. Myers, there is no functional difference between the use of *home* in the three sentences: "John went home," "John reached home," "John was home." And if we argue that the sentence "John was home" embodies a grammatical error, Mr. Myers is ready to pooh-pooh our scruples. The word *home* has not changed its form. The three sentences are identical except for the verb—"and there is not the slightest advantage in making theoretical distinctions between them."

We have here a fair example of the kind of point that the new grammarians like to make, in the interest of realism and science. Though I would certainly prefer to call *home* an adverbial objective in the sentence "John went home," I do not think it worth while to argue with Mr. Myers on a point of grammatical terminology. That is, not if we are discussing an abstract example in grammar, without relation to any context.

But next I would say that Mr. Myers, while accusing us of making theoretical distinctions, is indulging in theoretical examples, as all grammarians love to do. The specimen sentences offered by grammarians are invariably dull, dissociated, empty of meaning, and often a little preposterous; and that is, of course, one great reason why the study of grammar, as grammar, may become tedious or even revolting.

But if we put the constructions that Mr. Myers is exemplifying into a living context, we may quickly discover that the syntax of the word *home* may become a matter of critical, even of exciting importance. In a narrative of some tragic return, qualified by specific human circumstances, I dare say that a skilful writer would have to decide whether there is anything more than a theoretical distinction between "John reached home," "John went home," and "John was home." Was the ghost of Latin grammar peeking over Robert Frost's transom when he wrote the following passage:

> 'Warren,' she said, 'he has come home to die:
> You needn't be afraid he'll leave you this time.'
> 'Home,' he mocked gently.
> 'Yes, what else but home?
> It all depends on what you mean by home. . . .'
> 'Home is the place where, when you have to go there,
> They have to take you in.'[6]

According to the license allowed by the new grammarians, Mr. Frost might just as well have written, in the first of the lines quoted, "Warren," she said, "Silas *is* home to die." It would have been just as correct, grammatically, as "Warren," she said, "he *has come* home to die." Whether or not Mr. Frost was attended in this instance by the ghost of Latin grammar, I do not know. I do know that Mr. Frost is a good Latinist, never far from the real presence of his Horace and Catullus. But it is certain that Mr. Frost, the artist, knew the rhetorical superiority of "has come home to die" over "is home to die" in that poetic context. There is no American writer, of past or present, who can more cunningly or more beautifully turn grammar into the service of rhetoric than Robert Frost.

I cite the examples from Grammarian Myers and Poet Frost to illustrate the

[5] L. P. Myers, *American English: A Twentieth Century Grammar* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952), p. 102.

[6] Robert Frost, "The Death of the Hired Man," *Collected Poems of Robert Frost* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1939), pp. 52-53.

gulf between what the grammatical specialist will tell us about a specific type of construction and our own feeling of how the construction works in a fine literary context. We must have a grammatical knowledge, and with it, a sufficient facility in grammatical analysis, to tell us what the grammatical structure is in such sentences as I have cited. Such knowledge and facility are indispensable, and I do not think it matters very much whether we follow the old grammar or the new in applying them. They do not differ very much, after all, in real essentials. And the ghost of Latin grammar, too, will always be there, since there is no other equally suitable source from which to secure a terminology and the concepts that go with it. What we most sadly lack—and that is the field that requires particular attention—is an acceptable and workable system of rhetorical analysis to parallel the grammatical analysis and to use in teaching. A grammatical analysis will disclose grammatical structure, but it will not necessarily reveal the rhetorical structure that is interwoven with it—that indeed often forms a cross-pattern to the grammatical structure.

I take a sentence from a recent book, *Dance to the Piper*, by Agnes De Mille:

> I continued in a happy somnambulistic state, blousy, dishevelled, dropping hairpins, tennis balls, and notebooks wherever I went, drinking tea with Dr. Lily Campbell and the professors, lapping up talk of books and history, drinking tea with classmates and Elizabeth Boynton, the librarian, having dates or nearly dates with the two *M's* on either side of me, Macon and Morgan, having dates with Leonard Keeler, who was working out campus thefts and misdemeanors with the first lie detector, falling asleep in all afternoon lectures, late for every appointment (once when I entered English history on time the whole class burst out laughing).[7]

[7] Agnes De Mille, *Dance to the Piper* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1952), p. 75.

This rather extraordinary sentence is a perfectly effective description of a confused adolescent girl who is in college without knowing exactly why or wherefore—and that is just the effect that Agnes De Mille intended to convey. But a grammatical analysis tells us nothing at all about the effect, and may even mislead a student reader who is trained in grammar but not in rhetoric. To the grammarian there is nothing very extraordinary about the sentence. The simple subject *I* is immediately followed by the simple predicate *continued* which has as its adverbial modifier the phrase *in a happy somnambulistic state*. The remainder of the sentence is a string of modifying adjectives and participial phrases, arranged in series. There may be a moment's grammatical hesitancy to decide whether *blousy, dishevelled, dropping, etc.* modify the noun *state* or the subject *I*. The grammarian will probably conclude that they modify *I*, though the postpositive arrangement of the series makes grammatical relationship a little ambiguous, as often happens in English. As to the parenthetic matter stuck on at the end, the grammarian must parse that as a separate sentence which modifies nothing; and he would probably insist that the parenthetical matter be punctuated as a separate sentence without parenthesis marks.

For the rhetorical analyst, the pattern takes a quite different shape. The subject *I* and the principal verb *continued* are rhetorically little more than directive expressions. The phrase *happy, somnambulistic state* is the pivot or center of the sentence, upon which everything in the sentence turns. If it were possible to use such a term, this phrase would have to be called the *rhetorical subject* of the sentence, even though, grammatically, it must

rank as a humble prepositional phrase, used as an adverb. As for the ambiguity of relationship in the series of modifying phrases—the ambiguity that bothers a grammarian—that may be an object of great interest to the rhetorician. For, in rhetoric, the long series of adjectives and participles does in effect adhere both to *I*, the subject of the sentence, for purposes of personal identification, and to *somnambulistic state* for the purpose of expanding the meaning through specific detail. The rhetorician further notes that the formation of the sentences by a long series of accumulated phrases, more or less in parallel structure but not strictly so, is charmingly appropriate to the helter-skelter nature of the college life (the "happy, somnambulistic state") that is being described. For the same reason he tolerates, and perhaps blesses, the bulky parenthetic sentence that is "tacked on" at the end.

Grammarians, of course, know nothing of such a phenomenon as a rhetorical subject or pivot expression. Therefore a student who is trained in grammatical analysis only, with no accompanying education in the art of rhetoric, may very easily acquire the notion that the subject and the verb (the simple subject, the simple predicate) are the really important parts of a sentence, and that the subordinate parts of a sentence, whether subordinate clauses or modifying phrases, are somehow or other to be despised as inferior, being as far below subject and predicate in rank as mere private soldiers are below the generals. And we as teachers, in our anxiety to drill students in the importance of predications and in abhorrence of fragmentary sentences and other incomplete constructions, have therefore often been guilty of conveying rather perverted and false notions of what a sentence really is. From this source, perhaps, comes a great deal of very stilted writing.

The grammarian will recognize, of course, the functional use of *it* and *there* as grammatical subjects, followed by a predicating copulative verb, and thus, in a particular technical instance, will acknowledge that the logical subject of the sentence is in the complement rather than in the so-called grammatical subject. "It is very necessary that I have the above recommendations" is one of the examples that Mr. Fries gives of this construction. But Mr. Fries does not undertake to say anything about the circumstances under which this construction will be more or less effective, useful, or beautiful than some other type of construction. We can learn about that, however, if we look into the right authors. I turn to Macaulay's *History of England* and choose a passage in which Macaulay, the devoted Victorian Liberal, is explaining, with a considerable amount of ironic gusto, just what the situation of the English Tories was in 1688, when it became painfully necessary for them to part company with James II and find "good reasons" for reversing their old adherence to the divine right of kings, which naturally also implied passive obedience by the citizens of the kingdom:

> It was not merely by arguments drawn from the letter of Scripture that the Anglican theologians had, during the years which immediately followed the Restoration, labored to prove their favorite tenet. They had attempted to show that, even if revelation had been silent, reason would have taught wise men the folly and wickedness of all resistance to established government. It was universally admitted that such resistance was, except in extreme cases, unjustifiable.[8]

In each of these three powerful sen-

[8] Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second* (New York: Hurd and Houghton, 1866), Vol. III, Chapter IX, p. 269.

tences the predication itself is rhetorically much less important than the sentence elements that are set in a grammatically minor position.

Instead of making an analysis, let us try to reconstruct the sentence to give the important rhetorical elements as strong a predicative position as possible:

> During the years which immediately followed the Restoration, arguments drawn from the letter of Scripture were not the only means by which the Anglican theologians labored to prove their favorite tenet. According to their attempts at justification of their position, reason would have taught wise men the folly and wickedness of all resistance to established government, even if revelation had been silent. Such resistance was universally admitted to be, except in extreme cases, unjustifiable.

In this rewriting, I have attempted to eliminate the almost purely functional predications: "It was not merely that . . . ," "They had attempted to show that . . . ," and "It was universally admitted that . . . ," and have given a subject-verb-complement position to "arguments drawn from the letter of Scripture," "reason would have taught," and "Such resistance was . . . unjustifiable." But I doubt whether the passage has gained in force from this functional shift. You have doubtless noticed that I was obliged to resort to a piece of common journalese in saying "According to their attempts at justification" instead of Macaulay's "They had attempted to show that . . ." So today, our Washington reporters will say, "According to Secretary Dulles" instead of "Secretary Dulles attempted to show that." And doubtless the kind of prose we encounter in such concoctions is one of the reasons why our newspapers often fail to be convincing. But as for Macaulay, it is perfectly evident that he is deliberately using a kind of indirect quotation to echo, in ironic tones, though with seeming detachment, the actual arguments, now become more anxious than sincere, of the embarrassed Tories of 1688. We have here a peculiar kind of historical reportage, based upon rhetorical manipulation of sentence elements, which has been used with great success by Lytton Strachey, Charles A. Beard, and others.

The field of inquiry into such matters is obviously large, and not very much explored. I will not detain you by dwelling upon a great number of specific illustrations. The few I have given are of the kind I would like to see presented to students in writing. My own experience is that students respond enthusiastically to rhetorical analysis of this kind when it is applied very intensively to short passages. They never rebel against grammar, once they can see its use and application in the structure and texture of a prose that interests them. Once we see the grammar in rhetoric, or the rhetoric in grammar, the grammar is no longer dull, and there is less need of the eternal admonitions about correctness that have been the bane of the composition teacher's life. At the same time, the rhetoric becomes less vague and elusive. We discover—and the student discovers—that some means is available for determining just how the enchanting or powerful effects are obtained, and that fairly precise terms can be used for describing those effects. Thus rhetoric comes into a field of practical discussion, and we as teachers may at last have something to talk about besides denotation and connotation, concrete and abstract diction, and figures of speech.

This approach to rhetoric is applicable in many ways. The grievous question of tense and tense forms, of moods, of passive and active, ceases to be quite as grievous when it becomes an element in the study of rhetorical patterns. For example, in most narrative writing, the sovereign governing tense is the past

tense. It is easy for the student to understand that. Suppose then I take a few paragraphs from W. H. Hudson's *Far Away and Long Ago*, and put them before a student. Four paragraphs, five paragraphs, six paragraphs, all are in past tense, as would be expected. But in Paragraph 7, something happens:

> Again and again this bird, and one of the others I rode at, practised the same pretty trick, first appearing perfectly unconcerned at my presence and then, when I made a charge at them, with just one little careless movement placing themselves a dozen yards behind me.
>
> But this same trick of the rhea is wonderful to see when the hunted bird is spent with running and is finally overtaken by one of the hunters who has perhaps lost the bolas with which he captures his quarry, and who endeavours to place himself side by side with it so as to reach it with his knife . . .[9]

The matter of the change from past tense to present tense is something for the student to explain. A small problem, no doubt, but a troublesome one nevertheless, if he has learned too well from some handbook that a "shift of tenses" must be avoided. The nature of tense, as treated in a handbook or a grammar, is one thing; it is quite another when one is himself composing a narrative, or is analyzing a narrative bit from so excellent a writer as W. H. Hudson. The problem may take on its nuances, too. In a sketch called "Illinois Bus Ride," the naturalist Aldo Leopold uses the present as his sovereign tense:

> I am sitting in a 60-mile-an-hour bus sailing over a highway originally laid out for horse and buggy. The ribbon of concrete has been widened and widened until the field fences threaten to topple into the road cuts. In the narrow thread of sod between the shaved banks and the toppling fence grow the relics of what was once Illinois: the prairie.
>
> No one in the bus sees these relics. A worried farmer, his fertilizer bill projecting from his shirt pocket, looks blankly at the lupines, lespedezas, or Baptisias that originally pumped nitrogen out of the prairie air and into his black loamy acres. He does not distinguish them from the parvenu quack-grass in which they grow. Were I to ask him why his corn makes a hundred bushels, while that of non-prairie states does well to make thirty, he would probably answer that Illinois soil is better. Were I to ask him the name of that white spike of pea-like flowers hugging the fence, he would shake his head. A weed, likely.[10]

In a subtle bit of prose like this, which in itself is a profoundly symbolic and highly dramatic evocation of the contrast between the tired American present and the lively and magnificent American past, the teacher has all the opportunity he needs to convince an alert student of the pertinence of tenses and tense forms, moods and mood-forms.

Or, if we would venture among other kinds of subtleties, we might put before the student that passage in *Gulliver's Travels* in which the officers of the King of the Lilliputians make an inventory of the contents of the Man-Mountain's pockets. Gulliver draws from his fob pocket a chain, at the end of which hangs a round object—

> . . . which appeared to be a globe, half silver, and half of some transparent metal; for on the transparent side we saw certain strange figures circularly drawn, and thought we could touch them, till we found our fingers stopped by that lucid substance. He put this engine to our ears, which made an incessant noise like that of a water-mill: and we conjecture it is either some unknown animal, or the god that he worships; but we are inclined more to the latter opinion, because he assured us . . . that he seldom did any thing without consulting it. He called it his oracle, and said it pointed out the time for every action of his life.[11]

[9] W. H. Hudson, *Far Away and Long Ago* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1929), p. 91.

[10] Aldo Leopold, *A Sand County Almanac* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949), pp. 117-118.

[11] Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels* (New York: The Modern Library College Editions), pp. 36-37.

This famous passage is as simple, plain, and matter-of-fact as a laboratory report or a sociological survey. It seems to contain no rhetorical quirks of any great importance. It is as grammatical as it needs to be—unless you want to quarrel with the possibly ambiguous reference of the pronoun *which* in the sentence, "He put this engine to our ears, *which* made an incessant noise . . ." But to apply either grammar as grammar or grammar as rhetoric to this particular passage will not help us to find the key to its intent and its peculiar power. We have arrived at a point—as sooner or later we always will—where the province of grammar and the province of rhetoric cease to overlap or interlock. We are now entirely within the province of rhetoric, and new considerations must come into play.

Herbert Read, in his *English Prose Style*,[12] has noted that Jonathan Swift very deliberately avoids metaphorical language. Swift's diction is clear and sharp in its conveyance of images, but the words that imprint the images are consistently non-metaphorical, even to the point of being commonplace. This observation of Mr. Read's is true if we approach a particular passage at the level of realism and matter-of-fact—as a child reader would approach it. It is not true if we stop to remember that each voyage of Lemuel Gulliver is a gigantic figure of speech, which requires us to assume a metaphorical attitude toward every seemingly matter-of-fact detail set before us. And this metaphorical attitude, which is Swift's own attitude, enforces a double point of view—or a conflict of points of view. Likewise it imperceptibly forces us to make metaphysical and ethical judgments. The Lilliputian inventory gives us what we instantly recognize as an inadequate description of a watch—yet a description accurate enough within its limits. If we reflect further, we may conclude that no merely matter-of-fact inventory can be adequate if it is based upon limited knowledge. But, since the inventories made by business and science must be based upon limited knowledge—and are not considered useful or accurate unless they are thus limited—we may be led to doubt the complete validity of matter-of-fact inventories, which is exactly what Jonathan Swift wishes us to do. Thus does a great writer, by means of a dominant rhetorical device, infuse double or multiple meanings into even the simplest words. Grammar will not help us here. We have moved into the higher reaches of the art of rhetoric. In those higher reaches, there are great risks and great responsibilities to accompany the evidently great achievements. We must be willing to take those risks and responsibilities, if we are to fulfill completely our tasks as teachers of writing or of speech. Nor can we avoid them, indeed, since every act of writing or speaking involves us in commitments which we would be foolish not to recognize and with which we must somehow learn to deal honestly.

In Plato's *Phaedrus*, Socrates deals with the question of rhetoric and truth, and at one point has Rhetoric (personified) say: "I do not compel anyone to learn to speak without knowing the truth, but if my advice is of any value, he learns that first and then acquires me. So what I claim is this, that without my help the knowledge of the truth does not give the art of persuasion."

This passage is quoted by Mr. Richard Weaver in his newly published book, *The Ethics of Rhetoric*,[13] in which the

[12] Herbert Read, *English Prose Style* (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1931), pp. 26-27.

[13] *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

problem of our responsibilities in dealing with language and dialectic is most wisely and brilliantly discussed and illustrated. I have earlier quoted from Mr. Weaver and I commend his book most heartily to all those teachers and students who in these confused times seriously wish to distinguish and understand the nature of their responsibility. In terms of my own preceding discourse, what Socrates has Rhetoric say can mean, in part, that the truth of grammar is to be learned first and then applied, as I have suggested, in the art of rhetoric. There is a sphere of study where we can treat grammar as rhetoric and rhetoric as grammar—where, indeed, grammar *is* rhetoric and rhetoric *is* grammar. But the truth of grammar is only a small part of the truth, and if we are not to go astray, we need to explore the larger field of truth in relation to rhetoric. And one of Mr. Weaver's great services is to show us, most convincingly, that we cannot hope to avoid the dangers of rhetoric—the use of an evil or false rhetoric—by attempting some kind of neutral discourse which is "true" but not in any sense "rhetorical." Except in mathematics, and perhaps in scientific formulas, there is no discourse which can be "true" and at the same time "non-rhetorical." Scientists (particularly the social scientists) may be under the delusion that so-called scientific writing avoids all rhetoric and deals only in facts, uncolored by rhetoric, but they are mistaken. They are merely writing very badly; that is, they are using false rhetoric without knowing it. The best scientific writers are always good rhetoricians. They know that without the aid of rhetoric to set forth truth, this truth will issue in a weak or distorted form that makes the expression of it less than truth, if not a positive deception. "Scientific intention," says Mr. Weaver,

> turns out to be enclosed in artistic intention and not *vice versa*. Let us test this by taking as an example one of those 'fact-finding committees' so favored by modern representative governments. A language in which all else is suppressed in favor of nuclear meanings would be an ideal instrumentality for the report of such a committee. But this committee, if it lived up to the ideal of its conception, would have to be followed by an 'attitude-finding committee' to tell us what its explorations really mean. In real practice the fact-finding committee understands well enough that it is also an attitude-finding committee, and where it cannot show inclination, through language, of tendency, it usually manages to do so through selection and arrangement of the otherwise inarticulate facts.[14]

The duty of rhetoric is thus, in Mr. Weaver's phrase, "to bring together action and understanding into a whole that is greater than scientific perception."[15]

It is that wholeness, that harmony, of action and understanding, which I have been seeking to explore with you. Without rhetoric, we cannot achieve it. Without rhetoric, we will have not only "inarticulate facts," but students in writing and speech who are inarticulate as to facts and almost everything else. If we ignore rhetoric in our teaching, we shall not by that omission be eliminating rhetoric. We shall only be teaching false rhetoric and to that extent will be unconsciously engaging in an educational fraud. But I believe that every good teacher of writing or speaking is necessarily a rhetorician—though he may be driven by pedagogical and professional circumstance to bootleg rhetoric in under another name. It would be better, of course—far better—if we could stop our bootlegging and openly profess ourselves to be what, as devoted teachers, we ought to be—bold rhetoricians, not mere timid grammarians.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

THE RHETORIC OF CONCILIATION

Lyman Bryson

IN the practical world of today there is much argument and much confusion about the relative importance of group agreement and individual conviction. While we have enlarged our freedoms, we have also built up great collectives, and the habits of men in groups have become a major interest of social scientists. As one result the pendulum has swung far from simple assumptions about forensic methods which were once taken for granted as the democratic way, over to a belief that any "group" decision is a "right" decision. What does this do to our rhetoric?

At the outset we can observe that the older rhetorical principles may not be false, but they are certainly not adequate to the needs of a civilization become self-conscious and much better scientifically informed than its predecessors about the ways of men in argument and action. If a new rhetoric is to be evolved, it will be a rhetoric of conciliation, of democratic mediation among men. The development will obviously have educational meaning. We will train men for new political habits. We can all remember when it was generally believed that forensic combats were good training for young citizens, even when the conflict of opinion was motivated almost wholly by a desire to win. Now a number of teachers or practicing enthusiasts believe that, since any agreement is good, argument should be avoided. They quote as a profound truth, a remark often attributed to William Heard Kilpatrick, "Debate is immoral!"[1] To mediate between these two extreme positions in practice and in education is a doubly interesting exercise, worth doing for its own sake and for the typical problem it offers in the new kind of rhetoric.

Is there a middle ground? And does any reason, other than a desire to have peace, justify seeking it? In real situations men have always worked between the two positions, even the men who were spokesmen for the extremes. Practice has been better than preaching. But theory makes its own demands, and men need to know better how to describe what they can see happening.

The easy answer to the problem of mediating between those who want agreement at all cost and those who want victory at any cost is that everyone must be persuaded to seek the truth. This solution is easy because it begs the difficult question: how do we arrive at a working truth when men disagree as to what is *the* Truth? To make our own position clear, we must begin by confessing that we do not know any method by which truth can be infallibly discovered. There may be areas in which an absolute standard can be attained; the first argument among friends is likely to be on the question, what are those areas? Every era has produced many who could see a personal solu-

Mr. Bryson (A.B., 1910, A.M., 1915, Michigan; LL.D., Occidental) has held a number of distinguished civic and academic positions including a professorship at Teachers College, Columbia University, and a counsellorship with the Columbia Broadcasting System. He is the author of a number of books, including The Next America: Prophecy and Faith *(New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952) and the editor of others, including* Facing the Future's Risks *(New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952).*

[1] Although some of his disciples credit him with this remark, I cannot discover that he ever made it.

tion of some important question so clearly that they never realized they were blinded by simplicity; such persons make good persecutors, not good guides. We begin by saying that we give all men credit for sincerity; but we credit none of them with absolute wisdom. In the dialectic of daily affairs the rhetoricians' task is to find not absolute truth but other values which are possibly within reach. These values add up to that degree of peace which allows for integrity of mind but allows also for cooperation. They seek the practical agreements by which men can both keep their self-respect and get through the work of the world. These lesser goods can be goals because when attained they enable free men to seek truth, each in his own way.

All the steps in the process of discussion are stages of discovery, and the rhetoric of conciliation is best understood if argument itself is thought of as a tool for exploration. Then the danger is much less great that arguments may become either ends in themselves or weapons of personal aggressiveness. They can be used in their twofold purpose of getting at the complex truths men seek, and of adjusting the differences between men in order that they can live together. T. V. Smith has remarked that civilization is "the progressive enlargement of compromise-areas, so that power will not so easily and so fatally cancel itself out."[2] Thinking chiefly of the political aspect of civilization, he was trying to help us think through the problems created by two facts: that good men differ, and that they are no less good because they hold individual opinions. However, in spite of Smith's ironic wisdom men still have to find the way to meet duties both to themselves and to the group; pursuing the argument farther demonstrates that Smith believes in compromise for the sake of peaceful action in the larger areas of possible adjustment but does not believe any consensus will do merely because it is consensus. He insists rather that compromise must be debated fairly and must be finally limited by the freedom of persons to be themselves.

These hints of a basic attitude are perhaps as much as can be said by way of generalization. We are undertaking to indicate briefly a method which might be called either the rhetoric of conciliation, or the rhetoric of democracy. It rests upon the idea of a spiritual democracy, a willingness to accept any other man's cooperation,[3] in practical tasks, without demanding that he share all our beliefs or that he depend on our own ultimate sanctions. It is a difficult doctrine, but all the other difficult doctrines of democracy rest upon it. The new rhetoric can be defined in Aristotle's terms with the change of one word. As has been pointed out by Bower Aly, Aristotle assumes controversy as the ground of rhetoric, and so do we; but he appears to limit his interest to a decision reached by a conflict of motives; the new rhetoric wishes to go further. Aristotle's words are, "Rhetoric may be defined as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of *persuasion*."[4] Assuming that we wish to go beyond mere decision among differing opinions by combat or by persuasion, we can say, "Rhetoric may be defined as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of *mediation*." This statement does not mean that debate is to be evaded but that it is to be used and transcended, and that unchangeable dif-

[2] T. V. Smith, *Man's Threefold Will To Freedom* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1953), p. 9.

[3] Lyman Bryson, *The Next America* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), p. 226.

[4] *Rhetoric*. Bk. I, ch. 2.

ferences among men shall be respected and given their full opportunity.

This new rhetoric would then be not so much a compromise between respect for men and respect for truth, made for the sake of action, as a method by which as much as possible of both values would be sought, respect for men and respect for truth never being considered incompatible. Every person brings to a discussion three kinds of motives. First, his material and moral interests, as he estimates them, which include his possible belief that he has a stake in justice even when it goes against him. Second, his logic and sense of intellectual weights; he wants to be judged sensible, not a fool. Third, he has emotional tendencies which may or may not converge with the other two kinds of motivation. Emotion may make him behave like a fool even when he is half aware of his lapse; or it may make him go against what he thinks is his welfare.

These three kinds of disposition drive men against each other; when a group reaches an agreement, some kind of adjustment has been achieved among them. All discussion is exploration because the first long step toward agreement is a searching scrutiny by every member of a group of his own and his neighbor's baggage of dispositions and powers. The short second step is to decide, after they have been rubbed together, which of them do not count, which can be changed, and which resist all question. Then an agreement, or a decision, is on solid ground.

The method may be described in terms of stages of discussion: first, exploration; second, debate; and third, decision. These words are not endowed with any new or technical meanings; to use them in their familiar clusters of multiple significance seems better than to burden thought with fresh jargon. Exploration is getting acquainted with an intellectual landscape. Debate is putting opinions into open combat. Decision is ending debate and beginning action. Clearly any group, at any time, and in the discussion of any question, may stop short of the second stage, or the third. Some questions do not in any actual sense lead to action, even after debate is done with. Nevertheless, the process is in one direction in all cases and is best managed if the stages are not forgotten but kept in the background of thought by all participants.

Exploration, the first stage, has several interlocked purposes. It seeks to locate and clarify the question at issue. Even in the comparatively formal conditions of school or parliamentary debate, when the question is officially given, it is often unwise if not impossible to accept the statement as wholly clear and wholly competent. The difficult problems in logic here involved cannot be gone into, but this initial process of locating the true issue is a good ground on which any participant in a discussion may test his own flexibility and open-mindedness.

A question much debated both scholastically and politically in recent years, for example, is: Should the exploitation of tidelands oil be controlled by the individual states or by the federal government? Obviously, the question is complicated, and chance has already determined which of its complexities will hold the interest of each debater, or discussant, or enquirer. To one it is a legal question, and constitutional arguments are overwhelmingly important. To another historical facts are essential; to another, moral facts, to another—there is always a surprise! The mere cataloguing of these aspects of a manifold question does not suffice, nor is an issue successfully cleared up when it is reduced to its comprised subordinate

issues. Many questions of this kind are best reduced to a different level of generalization, as when the tidelands oil question is restated: Is it better to have public or private exploitation?

Some difficulty in keeping argument out of discussion should be expected even in this exploratory beginning. Unless participants are dully unaware of the effect of restating a question, they will have prepared their own contributions, or will spontaneously arrange them to fit a statement of the question that gives them good ground to stand on. A debater who thinks he has a weak case for private enterprise will insist that the issue is merely legal or historical and that public policy is not the point, while one in another political camp, trusting in the appeal of the public good, as stated in conventional public ownership terms, will concentrate on that appeal.

How then can exploration be urged when it turns up differences which discussants who are intent on winning a decision prefer to keep hidden? This is one of the most difficult of problems for a leader or for any member of a group in any kind of opinion-comparing work. In a purely parliamentary situation, when a decision on future action outweighs, in the minds of all participants, all other considerations except honesty, it is often futile to try to confront directly an ideally clear issue. Argument as to what is at issue and argument as to what should be done become intertwined, and exploration turns into open debate. The success of exploration depends in almost exact proportion on the extent to which the members of a group are uncommitted and open to learning. The members who are thus free of conviction will probably lose their argumentative innocence in the process, but they gain insight and take definite steps toward decision. All can gain by the trial.

The second purpose of exploration is to get expressed, so all may know them, the predisposed opinions that were brought to the discussion. Some original opinions are never divulged and some are best ignored; the need is for an adequate list of the opinions likely to be supported and some indication of the kind of reasoning behind them. This procedure is to deploy the opposing troops, as when, in old-fashioned battles, the opposing generals got their men and chariots and slingshots into position, with either guile or menace, and waited for the first trumpet. Military analogies are easy to overdo, and discussion is not battle, but the good will and good humor of the members of the group do not change the fact that their opinions, as opinions, are still hostile to one another. The glossing over of this fact leads to false theories of compromise. The success of this part of the exploratory effort, the deploying of opinions and their arguments, depends on the capacity of the leader to induce the members to be patient and on their capacity for that virtue, since the tendency is to leap into argument, instead of merely stating a conviction and its reasons, after others have stated theirs.

The next purpose in exploration is to discover which elements in each man's opinion are to him the most important; to get, in other words, a kind of general valuation on the inventory of positions. The essential point is not the value of an opinion or of an argument in support of an opinion as judged by the group, but the sense of importance with which each opinion or argument is regarded by him who offers it.

Here much that is merely ornamental or fortuitous may be discarded willingly, without outside suggestion. If we are

given a chance to state what we think is of greatest moment to ourselves, and are not compelled by premature skirmishing to defend points we really do not care much about, we can remove from the discussion much that might irritate or even outrage some of our companions, and we can also strip our own minds for better action.

Perhaps it is needful to remind ourselves again that these purposes can be cleanly accomplished only in an ideal or type situation and that we can seldom expect to see any actual discussion work out in such neat steps. But in so far as the type process can be followed, we have now reached a point at which the members of a group have prepared themselves for active argument in a manner that is efficient as far as the subject is concerned and also favorable to good will and fair play. The logic of the issue and the positions of individuals regarding it have been indicated. Since their differences have been seen as honest in a clearly defined question, they ought to be able to regard each other's arguments on their merits.

In recent fashionable talk about personal relations, much, almost too much, has been said about the ways in which emotions clog up thinking. This point is almost the whole concern of studies in method that examine "personal interaction," or "amount of participation," or "willingness to change in the direction of the group." Some enthusiasts have swung so far to the other side from the old concern for impersonal logic that they seem to think that a pleasantly cooperative discussion will always reach wisdom. The element missing in this extreme position is the balancing realization that people are quite as likely to be emotionally upset by intellectual confusions as they are to get into confusions because they are emotionally upset. Sensitive teachers who have not succumbed to doctrinaire training know this fact about children; it is true of everyone. Hence, a chief element in method is that the utmost clarity as to the ideas of everyone participating should be reached early in a discussion, in advance of active argument if possible, not only for its logical value, but also because clarity is in itself a direct contribution to the emotional adjustments without which no reasonable decision is likely.

The next stage in discussion is debate. The word is used here as the most convenient name for more or less formal argument, not to signify a formal forensic contest; however, the debate stage is not only necessary but is the climax the other stages prepare us for. Thinking, as no one nowadays ought to need to be reminded, is a dynamic process, not a mere casting up of what shows in a catalogue of arguments. No debater can know either the strength of his own arguments, or the strength of those opposed, until there has been a lively and earnest trial at persuasion, each working on the others.

Debate is not intellectually enjoyable, spiritually enlightening, nor practically helpful, unless it is whole-hearted, vigorous, and fair. These statements are concerned with debates in which men have chosen their own positions, derived out of their own knowledge and their own ultimate principles, and in which the debaters care seriously about the decision, not for the sake of victory, but for the sake of advancing a chosen cause. The pedagogical justification for forensic contests is that many practical matters are settled in this way and that practice in an artificial situation teaches skill in thought and speech. I am old-fashioned enough to think there is merit in these exercises under good teaching.

But whether artificial practice is or is not good training for apprentices, a willingness to accept the debate situation when it is properly prepared for is one of the marks of a useful member of a deliberative group. A willingness to meet and manage this situation is also a mark of a good leader.

By this theory, however, in the rhetoric of mediation, even debate can be exploratory before it becomes decisive. It need not be a combat in which weak arguments are beaten down and the adventitious skills of eloquence and subtlety rewarded with a kind of gladiatorial palm. These skills deserve appreciation and are quite likely to get it, but debate, even when it is hot, is only the last stage in the exploration of personal opinions. We are assuming not only reasonableness and honesty but also that the participants in a group discussion are free persons and not bound by artificial disadvantages. That is, we are assuming that all have the same share in deciding the issue in the end. We are assuming that ideally every member of the group can retain the right to say, at the end, that he is not convinced, even though practical considerations may make him join in the group action.

Debate tends toward decision, but decision itself is a kind of final exploration of differences and of the manifold which is the question under discussion. By the time this point has been reached, in almost any group, the first work of decision has already been done; most of the participants will have cast off the accidental, non-essential elements of their own opinions. This adjustment is best done without explicit reference. Most members of the group will have got rid of something on the way, and mere tact as well as cooperative good will requires that each one take care of his own impedimenta and take no notice of the discards by his neighbors.

Beyond opinions which can be taken care of by adjustment, that is by indifference and discard, there are somewhat more stubbornly differing opinions which are not held for life or death but which have, nevertheless, a value. Opinions of this sort might be said to have a bargaining value. It is here that compromise takes place. This is the area which, as T. V. Smith says, grows as men become more civilized; one chief task of a statesman (whether in office or in the chair) is to suggest persistently the ways in which it can be enlarged. By the time a debate has gone on for a reasonable length of time, and in a reasonable tone, most clear-headed persons know what points they are willing to give up, for a price. The price in practical matters of business and government is often a straight *quid pro quo:* two opposing colleagues trade discards. Or, in many cases, a point of some, but not first, importance is surrendered because insistence stands in the way of effective group action. This is a sacrifice for the sake of decision.

When discoveries have been made as to what is easily discarded, and what is willingly traded, then we come to another area of opinion, to those points which involve such clear and valued principles that no compromise is possible. These are the ultimate elements in belief which demand attention and cannot be given up. Spiritual democracy does not require that we ignore these difficult obstacles to agreement; it demands rather that we respect them as essential to the integrity of our friends. If all the devices by which discoveries can be made have been well used, if the stages of exploration have been followed with a clear understanding of what was going on and what was hap-

pening to each participant's concurrent thinking, then residues of stubborn difference cannot be glossed over. They have proved adamant against argument; they have been sincerely avowed. Those who hold them can not accept anyone else's judgment as to their importance. If they are seriously in the way of agreement on decisions proposed, then a frank admission of failure to agree seems to be the best procedure.

Some groups now working in this field, practicing the extreme forms of the consensus-cult, appear to believe that there can be no such inexpugnable principles when all members of a group are fully aware of their duties to the group; that is, they believe that personal integrity must be overcome by the group spirit. I can see no moral grounds for such demands. One who enters a group for the achievement of purposes which he presumably holds in common with other members is not compelled by any moral principle of solidarity to make the group an end in itself, and he is required by self-respect to refuse on intellectual and logical grounds. To get the best thinking done on any question, stubborn personal opinions have to be gratefully acknowledged and studied. Nothing in modern ideas about dynamics changes what John Stuart Mill said a hundred years ago: "Mankind are greater gainers by suffering each other to live as seems good to themselves, than by compelling each to live as seems good to the rest."[5]

Groups may take still another step: it is the decision for action, if in the circumstances such a decision is called for. Some committees have mandates and must deliver recommendations; some learning groups get their greatest profit out of the explorations which make all of them better aware of the possible range of thinking. Each group must decide where it belongs in such a scale of requirements and each leader must keep the requirements in mind.

If a decision, an agreement on action, is required, then the unconvinced member has to decide for himself whether he can go along, in spite of unresolved reservations, or must withdraw. It should be noted that some groups which theoretically never take action except by majority approval are sometimes seen to bully the recalcitrant. An intellectual saintliness is required to accord quiet acceptance to an attitude which blocks a practically desirable agreement. But elevating group loyalty to a single kind of morality, against which no personal conviction can be allowed to stand, is not democratic: it is essentially tyrannous.

Here is the creative paradox of a rhetoric of mediation: the search for the grounds of decision is an effort to bring into a converging force all the elements in all the differing opinions that can drive action forward. At the same time, the search uncovers the differences which cannot be managed and undertakes to let people live with them in peace and friendliness. There are no safe formulas by which real differences can be smoothed out. The hope of a rhetoric of conciliation is that these differences will prove to be less in number and importance, and less hindering to practical cooperation, when all avenues of agreement and difference have been quietly explored, vigorously debated, and fairly judged. Most of the quarrels which stand in the way of our democratic working together are the fruits of intolerance and confusion. We have not tried often enough to find out what the last stand of each honest man would be, if he knew he would be protected in his integrity.

[5] John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, Ch. I.

RHETORICAL CRITICISM: A BURKEIAN METHOD

Virginia Holland

THE task of the rhetorical critic has traditionally been to answer these questions: what was the speaker's method? was it effective or not? why? In employing the traditional historical-literary methodology, the critic attempts to discover first *what the speaker said,* second, *why he spoke as he did,* and third, *how he said it.* Divining his meaning necessitates an understanding of the speaker's concepts, as well as a knowledge of the reliability and authenticity of texts; comprehending his reasons entails an analysis of the situation or problem that served as stimulus for his speech-response. The critic must consider historical and sociological backgrounds in order to bring into sharp focus the similar attitudes held by audience and speaker which allow the speaker to identify his purpose with that of the audience, and account for the dissimilar attitudes that frustrate the identification. Consideration of how the speaker "said it" resolves into a literary-rhetorical analysis of his style and finally into an examination of his delivery.

The validity of the rhetorical critic's judgment will be determined by the nicety of balance which he maintains in the handling of each of the What, Why, and How questions, the completeness of his consideration of all the problems inherent in each of these questions, and the thoroughness of analysis and accuracy of interpretation of each of these problems.

The purpose of this paper is to suggest how some of the rhetorical insights of Kenneth Burke,[1] particularly the concept of identification through strategies, as set forth in his *Philosophy of Literary Form*[2] and *Rhetoric of Motives*[3] can provide a methodology that will lessen the difficulty of the rhetorical critic's task and provide tools for sharper insights. The paper will consider first, the literary-rhetorical question, *how the speaker said it;* and second, the sociological-rhetorical question, *why the speaker spoke as he did.*

I

Ordinarily, when the rhetorical critic reads or listens to a speech and attempts to analyze *how the speaker said it,* he asks himself such questions as: what were the lines of argument? what were the emotional appeals?

Instead of plaguing himself with what often appears to be a confusing dichotomy of logical versus emotional appeals, why should not the critic ask the question that combines the answers to both within its answer—*What were the speaker's strategies?* This question should bring about a desirable change in em-

Miss Holland (B.A., University of Illinois, 1938; M.A., University of Michigan, 1941) has been Instructor in English at Washington University, St. Louis. She is now engaged in graduate study at the University of Illinois.

[1] For a comprehensive statement of Burke's theory see Marie Hochmuth, "Kenneth Burke and The New Rhetoric," *QJS,* XXXVIII (April 1952), 133-144.

[2] Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (Louisiana, 1941). See part I, pp. 1-8, and also part III, pp. 293-304, for Burke's explanation of the strategy concept.

[3] Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (New York, 1950). See pp. 20-37 for Burke's explanation of the identification concept.

phasis and make possible a closer approximation to ideal criticism.

If Burke's stricture that "critical and imaginative works are answers to questions posed by the situation in which they arose"[4] is true, then a speaker's speech is his symbolic response to a situation or problem, and is, as Burke has suggested, not merely an answer to a situation, but a strategic or stylized answer,[5] for the speaker symbolizes his attitudes in the form of strategies with which he hopes to modify or sustain the situation. The speaker's individual strategies are his stylistic devices for encompassing a situation, and the over-all strategy of his speech is *per se* his style.

Burke uses the word *strategy* as synonymous with the word *method* and the word *attitude*.[6] For purposes of rhetorical criticism, however, the critic would do well to consider *strategy* as synonymous with *method*, but different from the word *attitude*. A strategy may be thought of as a plan of attack, a way of meeting a problem or situation, but an attitude *initiates* the strategy. For example, a speaker may approach an audience with an attitude of righteous indignation over a problem that he feels is going to be solved in the wrong way. In order to get his own remedy accepted by the audience he may decide that the best method or strategy to use in his particular case is invective. In other words, a speaker realizes that the individuals making up his audience come to the speech situation with a composite of attitudes which may be said to constitute their individual egos. The speaker desires so to identify these audience attitudes with his own that the audience will accept his remedy. His *attitude* toward the problem of identification initiates the strategies with which he will work upon the audience.

Considering the concept of strategy from this point of view at once reveals that whereas the semanticists are concerned with de-attitudinizing a word symbol in order to arrive at the essence of which the word is referent, the rhetorical critic would deliberately search for the word which was the essence of a speaker's strategy, which *named* it in all of its attitudinal implications. Strategies thus become Aristotle's *topoi*, activated attitudinally. For rhetorical purposes Aristotle's "places" are no longer static, but energized. For example, for the purposes of invention a speaker might go to the "place" or "topic" of patriotism, and, activating it attitudinally, emerge—depending upon which of the two general responses he decided to make to the situation—with a strategy of "flagwaving" or "debunking."

Within the present limitations, although a line-by-line or even paragraph-by-paragraph enumeration of the individual strategies used throughout a complete speech is impossible, a qualitative picture of the over-all strategic approach can be presented, and perhaps in a single passage or two, an isolated quantitative approach. Wendell Phillips' familiar *Murder of Lovejoy*[7] speech affords a basis for analysis.

The issues embodied in the resolutions to be presented to the audience at Faneuil Hall were these: should Boston go on record as opposing mob violence? should Boston protest against

[4] *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, p. 1.
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 297.

[7] Wendell Phillips, *Speeches, Lectures, and Letters* (Boston, 1872), I, 1-10. Although as Yeager has indicated in *The History and Criticism of American Public Address*, ed. W. N. Brigance (New York and London, 1943), I, 354, the best texts of this speech are to be found in the *Liberator* and the *Massachusetts Spy*, since authenticity is not the point at issue and the only purpose is to indicate how the strategy technique might be applied to *any* speech, the text chosen is more readily available to students of rhetoric.

the lawless disregard of property rights? should Boston protest against a lawless disregard of the freedom of speech and of press guaranteed by the Constitution? After Austin's speech the tenor of the issues changed to become these: were the Illinois rioters at Alton an "orderly mob" comparable to the Boston Tea spillers? were the Illinois rioters patriotically engaged in helping Missouri uphold her slave laws? did the northern agitator, Lovejoy, act presumptuously and imprudently, and deserve to die for his interference? would the South be in real danger if slaves were given more concessions and more freedom? The loud emotional acclaim greeting Austin at the conclusion of his speech indicated that the majority of the audience had, with him, answered each of these questions in the affirmative.

Phillips' task then became that of changing the emotional attitudes Austin had unleashed on the slave question into emotional attitudes upholding the cause of liberty and freedom. He had to substitute a concept of liberty that would arouse stronger responses than the concept of slavery had engendered. He had to excite patriotic emotions, and show that if mobs were permitted to kill those with whom they disagreed, the freedom of every American was precarious. He had to swerve the minds of the audience away from a contemplation of the slavery problem to a comprehension of the necessity for a government founded on law and order. He had to arouse in the audience a strong desire to preserve law and order.

The rhetorical critic is now confronted with the first problem: *How did the speaker say it,* in order to accomplish his objectives? Abandoning the traditional approach for a moment, the critic may apply Burke's technique and ask the question, "*What were Phillips' strategies?*"

The accurate naming of the strategies obviously depends upon a careful analysis of the speaker's language pattern to determine what words most realistically *name* the associative grouping of ideas which the speaker makes in his language. The more accurate the rhetorical critic is in selecting the word which names what the combinations of word symbols within the sentence and within the paragraph are really doing, the more valid is his rhetorical judgment. Once he has selected a name for what appears to be going on within the speech, that is, once he has named his strategy, his task is to present the language evidence he believes warrants the strategy-naming he has chosen.

The opening lines of the Lovejoy speech supply an example:

> We have met for the freest discussion of these resolutions, and the events which gave rise to them. I hope I shall be permitted to express my surprise at the sentiments of the last speaker,—surprise not only at such sentiments from such a man, but at the applause they have received within these walls. A comparison has been drawn between the events of the Revolution and the tragedy at Alton. We have heard it asserted here, in Faneuil Hall, that Great Britain had a right to tax the Colonies, and we have heard the mob at Alton, the drunken murderers of Lovejoy, compared to those patriot fathers who threw the tea overboard! Fellow citizens is this Faneuil Hall doctrine?[8]

What are the words *doing* in this passage? In substance Phillips has said to the audience, "You have heard a man who should know better expressing sentiments contradicting your ideas of justice and freedom. You have just heard him draw an ignoble comparison between the acts of your patriotic fathers and a mob of murderers, and you have accepted these base sentiments in Faneuil Hall, the Cradle of Liberty!" Is Phillips ridiculing the audience? admonishing it? rebuking it? What word names what

[8] *Speeches, Lectures, and Letters,* p. 2.

the associated ideas in this paragraph are doing? Phillips is doing more than ridiculing or belittling the audience; he is not admonishing or warning it. He is sharply and sternly reproving it for accepting the words of Austin. Consequently, the word which most nearly approximates the ideas culminating in the cry, "Is this Faneuil Hall doctrine," is the word *rebuke*.[9] Phillips' attitude of indignation may be said then to be activated in the strategy of rebuking.

After rebuking the audience Phillips proceeds at once to a consideration of the ideas in the first issue, namely, were the Illinois rioters at Alton an "orderly mob" comparable to the men in the Boston Tea Party? Asserting that the "mob at Alton were met to wrest from a citizen his just rights,—met to resist the laws,"[10] Phillips says:

> We have been told that our fathers did the same; and the glorious mantle of Revolutionary precedent has been thrown over the mobs of our day (*mocking*).[11] To make out their title to such defence, the gentleman says that the British Parliament had a *right* to these Colonies (*derision*).[12] It is manifest that, without this, his parallel falls to the ground; for Lovejoy had stationed himself within constitutional bulwarks (*vindication*).[13] He was not only defending the freedom of the press, but he was under his own roof, in arms with the sanction of civil authority (*vindication*). The mob who assailed him went against and over the laws. The *mob* as the gentleman terms it,—mob forsooth! certainly we sons of the tea-spillers are a marvellously patient generation! (*mocking*)—the "orderly mob" which assembled in the Old South to destroy the tea were met to resist, not the laws, but illegal exactions (*vindication*). *Shame* on the American who calls the tea-tax and stamp-act laws (*rebuking*). Our fathers resisted, not the King's prerogative, but the King's usurpation (*vindication*). To find any other account, you must read our Revolutionary history upside down (*pointing out absurdity*).[14]

Throughout the entire passage the point-by-point contrast of the action of the Alton mob toward Lovejoy with the action of the Boston patriots indicates that the strategies of mocking and deriding the former, and vindicating the latter, were used for the express purpose of making clear the over-all *strategy of pointing out the absurdities* of Austin's comparison which is epitomized in the ringing declaration, "To find any other account, you must read our Revolutionary history upside down!"[15]

Continuing with strategies vindicating the acts of our forefathers and heaping absurdities on Austin, Phillips follows with emotional, patriotic words which may be comprehended within the *strategy of flagwaving*. He says:

> Sir, when I heard the gentleman lay down principles which place the murderers of Alton side by side with Otis and Hancock, with Quincy and Adams, I thought those pictured lips (pointing to the portraits in the hall) would have broken into voice to rebuke the recreant American,—the slanderer of the dead.[16]

[9] *Webster's Dictionary of Synonyms* (Springfield, Mass., 1942), p. 701. To reprove is to blame or censure, often kindly and without harshness and usually, in the hope of correcting the fault: *admonish* stresses the implication of warning or counsel; *rebuke* implies sharp or stern reproach. He rebuked Peter, saying, "Get thee behind me, Satan." (Mark viii. 33).

[10] *Speeches, Lectures, and Letters*, p. 2.

[11] *Webster*, p. 713. *Mock* stresses scornful derision and usually implies words or gestures expressive of defiance or contempt. When used in reference to things, *mock* often implies a setting at naught and suggests scorn or derision.

[12] *Ibid.* *Deride* implies a bitter or contemptuous spirit. It means to make a person or thing the object of one's own or another's laughter.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 525. *Vindicate* means to uphold as true, right, just, valid, or worthy of notice or acceptance in the face of opposition or indifference. When the emphasis is on *defense*, then argument or something which has the force of argument is usually implied, and an aim not only to make one's point but to confute and confound one's opponents is often connoted.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 356. *Absurd* implies a judgment of a person, his acts, behavior, utterance, and the like, and means ridiculous because not exhibiting good sense. That is *absurd* which is inconsistent with accepted ideas, common sense, or sound reason; it is applied, therefore, to ideas and projects considered impersonally, as well as to persons and acts.

[15] *Speeches, Lectures, and Letters*, p. 3.

[16] *Ibid.*

Then, vehemently denouncing Austin, Phillips uses the *strategy of invective*:[17]

The gentleman said that he should sink into insignificance if he dared to gainsay the principles of these resolutions. Sir, for the sentiments he has uttered, on soil consecrated by the prayers of Puritans and the blood of patriots, the earth should have yawned and swallowed him up.[18]

Defiantly refusing to take back these words when the audience roars its protest, Phillips swings into the second issue: were the Illinois rioters patriotically engaged in helping Missouri uphold her slave laws? He makes short work of Austin's assertion that they were, using the *strategy of absurdity* which is climaxed in the comparison:

The Czar might as well claim to control the deliberation of Faneuil Hall, as the laws of Missouri demand reverence, or the shadow of obedience, from an inhabitant of Illinois.[19]

Giving his attention to the third issue: did the northern agitator, Lovejoy, act presumptuously and imprudently and deserve to die for his interference, Phillips denies these charges with the *strategy of vindication*. This over-all strategy of reciting vindicating facts which set the audience straight and show that Lovejoy was not imprudent or presumptuous is shot through with numerous *strategies of invective, flagwaving*, and *prayer*. The last is illustrated by such a statement as:

Shades of Hugh Peters and John Cotton, save us from such pulpits.[20]

It will be recalled that Phillips deliberately avoids bringing up the fourth issue: would the South be in real danger if slaves were given more freedom?

After such a qualitative, if not comprehensive, survey of the strategies in this speech, what may be said about the speech as a whole? Do the strategies add up to an overall, master strategy which would *name* Phillips' action in general? Phillips has rebuked the audience, pointed out absurdities in Austin's contentions, ridiculed his claims, vindicated Lovejoy's actions, prayed the country be saved from the encroachments upon liberty which Austin has favored, and waved the flag. Might not all these strategies be comprehended within the *name* exhortation?[21] Phillips' master strategy, or overall style, then, may be designated as *exhortation*.

The advantages to rhetorical criticism of such *descriptive naming* should be apparent. Not only would it avoid the bugaboo of an emotional versus logical dichotomy; it would eventually work out new lists of name words to describe *what* speakers did when the overall strategy or style of the speech was invective, exhortation, prayer, and so on. As new ways of reacting to a situation developed, new names would be added to the descriptive vocabulary. Furthermore, examination of the speaker's strategies would present a clearer picture of what the speaker *thought* his audience attitudes were.

We would find the answers to such questions as these: do preachers as a group use certain strategies? does the nature of their subject matter predetermine the strategies they use? how about the politician? the statesman? Might politicians, statesmen, and preachers be classed not by the group to which they belonged, but by the strategies they used? If, instead of classifying speakers

[17] *Webster*, p. 10. *Vituperation, abuse* and *invective* denote vehemently expressed condemnation or disapproval. *Vituperation* suggests the overwhelming of someone or something with a torrent of abuse (offensive language), but *invective* implies vehemence and bitterness in attack or denunciation, and often (in distinction from *abuse*) connotes a command of language and skill in making points. *It is the precise term when the attack is public and made in a good cause.*

[18] *Speeches, Lectures, and Letters*, p. 3.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[21] *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* (Springfield, Mass., 1949), p. 289. *Exhortation* means "language to incite and encourage."

as persuasive, informative, or entertaining, we were to use a strategy classification, would we not be indicating how they persuaded, how they informed, how they entertained? Would not this procedure tell us more than the old classifications? Would not this approach bring us nearer to the discovery of how speakers achieve identification with a specific audience through the use of language symbolization?

II

Furthermore, Burke has suggested certain other new directional questions related to the concept of strategies, which, if used by the rhetorical critic, would make our insights more penetrating and render the analysis of the sociological-rhetorical question: *why the speaker spoke as he did* less difficult.

Traditionally, in order to determine the background of the speech the rhetorical critic has asked such questions as: what were the times like? the events? the occasion? Would not the answers to these questions be thrown into sharper relief and the findings become more manageable in terms of his particular purpose if the rhetorical critic continued his research with such questions as these: what were the symbols of authority of the time?[22] Did the speaker reject or accept these symbols of authority? Did the speaker's audience reject or accept these symbols of authority? What were the sociological problems rising out of this rejection-versus-acceptance situation? What attitudinal words may be said to *name* these situations realistically? Can any existing words be said to *name* the strategy of an age? If the answer to questions like these were known would it not be easier for the rhetorical critic to determine the attitudes held in common by speaker and audience that make identification conceivable at all?

What were the symbols of authority of Phillips' age? the church? the judiciary? industry? A specific analysis of Phillips' *situation* is necessary. To illustrate: in Phillips' transitional era from strict Calvinistic orthodoxy to Liberalism in the religious and intellectual field two major strategies of meeting the situation evolved, namely, Revivalism and Transcendentalism; and in the economic transition in the North from agriculture to manufacturing three major strategies of meeting the situation evolved, namely, industrialism[23] in the North, pioneering in the West, and exploiting of virgin soil in the South.[24]

Out of the strategy of revivalism,[25] grew temperance societies, labor's rights societies, and abolitionism. Out of industrialism and Southern exploitation of soil grew anti-abolitionism. In the final analysis we might call the over-all strategy growing out of revivalism (labor, temperance movements, etc.) the strategy of crusading, as opposed to the strategies of industrial and agricultural exploitation.

The question for the rhetorical critic then becomes: with which strategy did Phillips identify himself? why? With which strategies did the audience he faced identify itself? why? If, after a consideration of these questions, the critic were to align Phillips as belonging to the crusading strategists and his hostile audience with the exploiting strategists, the important question then

[22] *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, pp. 305-308.

[23] V. L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought* (New York, 1927). I, Part 2. See chapter 2 entitled "Winds of Political Doctrine."

[24] Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization* (New York, 1935), ch. 17, p. 4.

[25] Gilbert Hobbs Barnes, *The Anti-Slavery Impulse, 1830-1844* (New York, 1933). See especially chapters 1, 2, and 10 for discussion of the Great Revival and the movements growing out of it.

becomes, "What crusading strategies does Phillips use for identifying the attitudes of the strategists of exploitation with his?"

Does Phillips' crusading strategy follow the religious pattern of Christianity? Does the secret of his powers of identification lie here? Burke has shown that Hitler's strategy in *Mein Kampf* was a perversion of the religious pattern of Christianity.[26] Would it be possible to show that Phillips' strategy on the other hand was an idealized materialization of the religious pattern of Christianity? Could it be shown that through this strategy he was able to identify the interests of the exploiting strategists with his own?

According to Burke, the major lines of belief set forth in the pattern of Christianity establish certain devices which unify men. Through these devices of the Church men are able to feel, in Burke's terms, *con-substantial*.[27] That is, they are united in areas of belief which join them together and make them identify their interests with each other's, as Burke suggests, for example, with the major tenets of Christianity.[28] "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" becomes a unifying appeal: there is an inborn dignity in all men; this tenet becomes a source for a speaker's invention. The second tenet that Sin, symbolized by the Devil, is the common enemy of all becomes the unifying device of assuming that ills can be charged to a scapegoat and the sinner purified by disassociation; the third tenet of rebirth in the name of Christ, the symbol of God and Good, becomes the unifying appeal for symbolic rebirth; the fourth tenet that all sinners must be converted, becomes the unifying appeal to convert others to the cause. This unification made possible by the pattern of Christianity results in an identification of attitudes of individual members of the Christian group with those of others within their own group, and with those of other Christian groups.

Using Burke's scheme of the pattern of Christianity as one strategic device for identification, might not the rhetorical critic, for example, show that Phillips chose in turn the slave-owner, the church, big-business as his scapegoats? Did Phillips experience a rebirth himself in identifying his interests with the common man, rather than with the patrician class into which he was born? Would this account in part, at least, for the almost evangelical fervor of his speaking? Would the answer to these and similar questions not aid in explaining Phillips' rhetorical effectiveness? Would not the answer to questions such as these explain in part the rhetorical effectiveness of any speaker?

For that matter, is it not conceivable that all institutions whether they be political, educational, or social have within them devices or strategies for unification which are but modified variants of the religious pattern? Would it not be profitable for the rhetorical critic to analyze the symbolism inherent in the institutional structures serving as powers of authority for a speaker or audience in order to discover *how* these institutions identify?

Only a few of the questions growing out of insights derived from Burke have been mentioned here; some of the methodological tools which Burke suggests might well be tried. At times critics have seemed to belabor minutiae; nevertheless, they are concerned with making criticism relevant to the larger problem of human relations, and to the work of the world in general. Burke may be extending their reach.

[26] *Philosophy of Literary Forms*. See pp. 191-220 for "The Rhetoric of Hitler's Battle."
[27] *A Rhetoric of Motives*, pp. 20-23.
[28] *Philosophy of Literary Form*, pp. 202-204.

OLD VOICES IN THE NEW SOUTH

William B. Hesseltine and Henry L. Ewbank, Jr.

LATE in January, 1860, Lyman C. Draper, Corresponding Secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, received a letter from an old acquaintance in Mississippi who described himself as a "broken-down politician and a broken-up lawyer." His correspondent, one Charles D. Fontaine, was much concerned with the problems of the Southland. "I await the hour," he proclaimed, "when the assailed South shall need all the eloquence of her sons, and maybe their valor, to arouse her slumbering masses, to union and concert, in resisting the puritanical and meddling spirit of the North which has been so perseveringly and steadily advancing to the work of our subjugation. . . . In a sectional strife," he added, "I shall make myself heard."[1]

If orator Fontaine raised his voice to arouse the slumbering masses of the assailed South, it was not heard. He was already, in January, 1860, too late to contribute to the mounting winds of Southern eloquence with which her sons resisted the "meddling" spirit of the North. Other men, more forceful and better placed than broken-down politicians and broken-up lawyers were voicing the South's fears, arguing the South's case, and casting oral horoscopes of the future. The assailed South had no lack of eloquence.

Prominent among the statesmen and seers who aroused the South were Judah P. Benjamin of Louisiana; Joseph E. Brown, Alexander H. Stephens, and Robert Toombs of Georgia; Jefferson Davis, Henry S. Foote, and Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar of Mississippi; Henry W. Hilliard of Alabama; Robert Barnwell Rhett of South Carolina; and Henry A. Wise of Virginia. There were others, like Benjamin M. Palmer and Moses Drury Hoge, Presbyterian ministers both, whose pulpits echoed with theological arguments which bolstered the statesmen's speeches. There were still others, of course—for oratory blossomed in the South as literature flowered in New England—but these orators, at least, lived through the war and raised their voices again in the post-war years when a New South was rising from the ashes.

In the decade before the Civil War these men won the right to speak for the South, and, though their rhetoric ranged from the impassioned to the coldly logical, they spoke in unison for Southern rights. Thus Jefferson Davis, Senator from Mississippi, who claimed the mantle of John C. Calhoun and would later become the harassed President of the Southern Confederacy, could picture the South as defending the Constitution and Southern rights. "It is yours to maintain the Constitution," he told a Democratic Convention in Jackson in 1859, "and to adapt it to the changes of time and circumstance . . . it is yours to develop the institutions we inherited to their greatest capacity."

Mr. Hesseltine (A.B., 1922, Litt.D., 1949, Washington & Lee; A.M., Virginia, 1925; Ph.D., Ohio State, 1928) Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin, is currently M. D. Anderson Visiting Professor at Rice Institute. He is the author of a number of books, including Lincoln and the War Governors *and* Confederate Leaders in the New South. *Mr. Ewbank (B.A., 1947; M.A., 1948; Ph.D., 1952, University of Wisconsin) is Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of Debate at Purdue University.*

[1] Charles D. Fontaine to Lyman C. Draper, January 25, 1860. Draper Correspondence, State Historical Society of Wisconsin (Madison).

Senator Davis was no debater, quick with repartee for the hustings or with sarcastic quips in the Senate chamber; but his prepared orations, filled with information drawn from wide reading, bristled with logic.[2] Yet even his logic was not without its emotional impact; and when, in January, 1861, he withdrew from the Senate to follow his seceded state, his carefully reasoned argument for the rights of the South, spoken with the sadness of one who had said, "I love and venerate the Union of these States—but I love liberty and Mississippi more," brought tears even to Northern eyes.[3]

Equally logical and devoid of spread-eagle metaphors were the speeches of Alexander H. Stephens, who would become Vice President of the Confederacy. Once years before, at the beginning of his political career, Stephens had formulated his concepts of speech. Words, he said, were "moral instruments capable of effecting much, when properly applied and directed." He deplored, as a "waste of breath," references to Greece and Rome, Scipio and Hannibal, "or any of that learned sort of lore." Eloquence was an art consisting of "nothing more than in selecting and fitting the matter to the time, place, and circumstances." "Success in producing conviction is the object of oratory."[4] Following his own rules, Stephens won power and fame as an orator. His speeches were logical, lacking literary embellishment, but animated by his own intense personality. He had the quick wit of a ready debater, sarcasm, and the power of ridicule, but his listeners were more impressed by his keen analysis and his forceful logic. "What is this fraud, this iniquity, this crime against nature and against God?" he asked during the debates on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill in 1856. "It is the simple declaration of the principle that the people of the territories of Kansas and Nebraska—the pioneer freemen there—our own brothers in flesh and blood—going there from every State of the Union, for the purpose of settling that distant frontier—there to build up new homes for themselves and their posterity—should have the right . . . to form and mould such institutions for their own government as they pleased. . . ."[5] Already determined to retire from public life, Stephens opposed secession when it came, but opposed it on the grounds that the rights of the South could be better maintained in the Union. "Let us see," he begged the Georgia legislature after Lincoln's election, "what can be done to prevent a wreck."[6]

No less logical or analytical, yet more impassioned and far less devoted to the Union was Judah P. Benjamin, Senator from Louisiana, who was destined to be Secretary of State in the Southern Confederacy. Described by the antagonists whom he demolished as "a dangerous debater," he could argue the fine point whether slavery was a creature of statute law and point out sharply that when slavery was abolished in the Northern States just enough time was allowed to give their sanctimonious citizens convenient opportunity for selling the slaves to Southern planters.[7]

Even more blunt and bitter in debate was another Confederate Secretary of State, Robert Toombs, who, on the eve of secession, was Senator from Georgia.

[2] *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist; His Letters, Papers and Speeches*, ed. Dunbar Rowland (Jackson, Miss., 1923), IV, 62-63.

[3] *Op. cit.*, V, 40-45. The quotation is from the Jackson speech of July 6, 1859. See note 2.

[4] Henry Cleveland, *Alexander H. Stephens, in Public and Private; With Letters and Speeches, Before, During, and Since the War* (Philadelphia, 1866), pp. 51-52.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 538.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 695.

[7] *American Orations: Studies in American Political History*, ed. James Albert Woodburn (New York, 1899), III, 142.

Always an avowed secessionist, he rested the Southern case on the arbitrary acts of the North. In a valedictory address to the Senate, he pointed out that the Southerners "appealed to the Constitution, they appealed to justice, they appealed to fraternity, until the Constitution, justice and fraternity were no longer listened to in the legislative halls of the country, and then, sir, they prepared for the arbitrament of the sword."[8]

Less highly placed in the Confederate hierarchy, but no less articulate in behalf of the South, were other orators of the 1850's. Henry A. Wise, Congressman and Governor of Virginia, whom enemies characterized as a "blustering, noisy politician, forever seeking an opportunity for notoriety,"[9] was a florid speaker with an ability to turn even Washington's Farewell Address into an argument for the South. Speaking at the dedication of Houdon's statue of Washington at the Virginia Military Institute, he could claim the Missouri Compromise line a violation of Washington's wise counsel against political factions.[10] And Governor Joseph E. Brown of Georgia could warn his legislature, after Lincoln's election, that the Black Republicans, "flushed with victory, will be insolent in the hour of triumph."[11] In Alabama, Henry Hilliard, who was a Unionist, agreed that "the election of a Black Republican would result in the subversion of the government. The people of the South would not wait to see him clothed with the insignia of office."[12] In New Orleans, preacher Benjamin Morgan Palmer, in a Thanksgiving sermon, in 1860 viewed Lincoln's election as the "doom of our once happy and united Confederacy."[13] Speaking in Congress in defense of slavery, L. Q. C. Lamar of Mississippi summed up the matter by asserting, "the calamity of the times is that the people of the North do not understand the people of the South. . ."[14]

Clearly, the South on the eve of the Civil War did not lack eloquent men to arouse her masses. Secessionist and Unionist alike gave voice to the Southern cause. And when war came—perhaps, indeed, it came largely because of their voices—these men of words found themselves in situations demanding deeds rather than words. Their responses, however, were in words; and whatever else the embattled Confederacy may have lacked, it had no shortage of oratory. President Davis hurled imprecations at the enemy. "Your fathers . . . ," he told a band of western soldiers who returned to Richmond in 1863, "fought against a manly foe" in the armies of Cornwallis. "You fight against the offscourings of the earth. . . . Every crime which could characterize the course of demons has marked the course of the invader" of the South.[15] Vice President Stephens, steadily opposing Davis' alleged usurpations, stirred the people with calls for Southerners to remember that Constitutional liberty and independence were "co-ordinate, co-existent, co-eval, and forever inseparable."[16] In February, 1865, even as the Confederate star was sinking, Secretary of State Benjamin, denouncing the "Emperor

[8] *Op. cit.*, III, 295.

[9] George M. Towle, "Some Secession Leaders," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*, XXVI (1863), 677.

[10] Henry A. Wise, *Inaugural Address at Lexington, Va. Military Institute, July, 1856*, 22.

[11] Herbert Fielder, *A Sketch of the Life and Times and Speeches of Joseph E. Brown* (Springfield, Mass., 1883), p. 169.

[12] John Witherspoon DuBose, *The Life and Times of William Lowndes Yancey; A History of Political Parties in the United States, from 1834 to 1864; Especially as to the Origin of the Confederate States* (New York, 1942), I, 361.

[13] Wayne C. Eubank and Dallas C. Dickey, "Benjamin Morgan Palmer, Southern Divine," *QJS*, XXX (December 1944), 424.

[14] Edward Mayes, *Lucius Q. C. Lamar: His Life, Times, and Speeches, 1825-1893* (Nashville, 1896), p. 626.

[15] Rowland, ed., V, 391-393.

[16] Cleveland, p. 785.

Lincoln," urged Southerners to a final effort with the assurance that "if there be a hell on earth, it would be an universal emancipation of the negroes and the Yankees to rule over us."[17] Earlier, in Georgia, Governor Brown had painted the horrible results "if we are conquered, our property is confiscated, and we and our children are slaves to Northern avarice and Northern insolence . . ."[18] In Nashville, Henry S. Foote, who had been a constant source of trouble to Jeff Davis when they were both Senators from Mississippi, and now, as a Confederate Senator from Tennessee, was still a thorn in Davis' side, spoke out to promote the sale of Confederate bonds. "He who lends to our Confederate Government now gives freedom, security and independence to his country, earns for himself the respect and gratitude of all good men, and enrolls his name upon the pages of a nation's history as an upright, high spirited and patriotic citizen."[19]

In fact, so great was the oratorical outpouring on the Confederate cause that even an aroused and long-suffering people grew tired. "Speech making," moaned the Richmond *Daily Examiner*, just as the last Confederate Congress came to an end, "has become a weariness of the flesh, a bore, an impediment to business, a cheap commutation for active patriotism. It is well that Congress adjourns on Saturday, and that the Virginia legislators are also going to their homes." To make certain that the professional speakers did not get into the path of others whose actions were necessary to the success of the Confederate cause, they added, "Let none of them stop by the way to harangue the army. The army is more up to the mark than they."[20] One month later, the fighting was over. Both the guns and the voices of the South were silenced. The former were silenced forever; the latter only for the nonce.

It was not long before the voices of the old leaders, with some new orators joining the chorus, were heard again in Dixie. Some, to be sure, did not return to the platform. Notably, Robert Barnwell Rhett, the pre-war fire-eater, turned to the editorial columns of his Charleston *Mercury* to set forth his views. In the main, however, as new issues arose, it was the old orators to whom the Southern people were accustomed to listen, who brought forth new interpretations. Alexander Stephens, only lately Vice President of the Confederacy, returned to address the Georgia legislators in February, 1866, asking them to exercise "the simple, though difficult and trying, but nevertheless indispensible quality of patience. . . . [the] liberal spirit of forbearance amongst ourselves" and to accept the results of the war and abide by them in good faith. "I am frank and candid in telling you right here," he said, "that our surest hopes, in my judgement, of these ends, are in the restoration policy of the President of the United States."[21] A few months later, before the less public audience at a reunion of the Richmond Light Infantry Blues, the intransigent General Henry A. Wise, without the freedom of amnesty, voiced his hopes that victory for the Southern cause might yet come, when "Old Virginia" returned. "They have taken and are wielding her powers," he told his erstwhile comrades-in-arms, "If I am a traitor let them make the most of it. . . ." If I had triumphed, he said, they might have appealed for pardon, "but I would have seen them damned before I would have granted it." With the expression of

[17] Richmond *Dispatch*, February 10, 1865.
[18] Fielder, p. 265.
[19] Richmond *Daily Examiner*, October 12, 1861.
[20] Richmond *Daily Examiner*, March 10, 1865.
[21] Cleveland, pp. 806-811.

this sentiment, he was toasted as a "Prisoner of war — unforgiven, *unforgotten*."[22] In these words, the wartime leaders of the South set the conflicting patterns of thought which expressed and guided the reactions of their people to the policies of reconstruction.

In the main, it was at least five years before the fortunes of the Confederate orators were sufficiently recouped that they could afford effective leadership in politics or on the platform. The military and carpet-bag rulers managed to lead a sufficient number of voters to the polls to keep control over the ears if not the thoughts of the South. As time passed, however, some of those who had gained their fame as native leaders came to the fore again. When Lee died in 1870, Benjamin Morgan Palmer, who from his pulpit ten years before had advocated secession, was moved to say, "they wrong us who say that the South was ever impatient to rupture the bonds of the American Union." He paid tribute to Lee as one who saw his duty clearly and was able to tear himself away from all his early associations "to embark in the new, and with that modesty, that firmness, belonging only to the truly great, expressed his willingness to live and die in any position assigned to him."[23]

Two years later Palmer addressed the gathering at commencement at Washington and Lee University. He cited the need to maintain racial purity, individuality of character, and to "carry over to the future a patriotism that is born of adversity and trial." In a combination of metaphors, he exhorted the graduates not to destroy Rome, but to save Carthage, and to persevere on the ship of Union, though she drive upon the breakers, so that they could "save from the melancholy wreck our ancestral faith, and work out yet upon this continent the problem of a free constitutional and popular government."[24] A few months earlier he had told the Historical Society of New Orleans that the story of the South was being falsified in the accounts of the war, but concluded only that a "residuum of truth" still "points to the wholesome moral, that of all things on earth nothing is weaker than force; and in its calm judicial tone, pronounces the most withering sarcasm upon the ambitions and achievements of the sword."[25] Perhaps such words and thoughts as these, firm yet chastened by age or by the results of the war, made Palmer the popular occasional orator that he proved to be in the 1870's.

There was no hint of mellowness in the words of L. Q. C. Lamar when he took his place on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1874. During his pre-war years in the House Lamar had defended the existence of slavery in Mississippi on grounds that it was intentionally not restricted by Congress, and refuted the religious arguments used by abolitionists with the rationale that by establishing slavery among the Jews, God had "established the principle that there may be conditions and circumstances under which slavery is not 'hateful to God and unjust to man.' "[26] Acknowledging in 1874 that the South realized after the war that "the institution of slavery, with all its incidents and affinities, is dead, extinguished, sunk into a sea that gives not up its dead," and that secession had been completely denied, he continued the charge that the North had no interest in understanding or restoring the South.[27] Observing

[22] John Abram Cutchins, *A Famous Command, The Richmond Light Infantry Blues* (Richmond, 1934), pp. 172-173.

[23] Thomas Cary Johnson, *The Life and Letters of Benjamin Morgan Palmer* (Richmond, 1906), p. 350.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 354-362.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 353.

[26] Mayes, p. 627.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 661.

with trenchant logic that if the North was not fighting a war of aggression, it must have fought on the proposition that Union was the best for both sections, he charged the North with misrule and malfeasance in the reconstruction program. He urged the House to take action against Grant's policies in using the army and courts to depose the duly elected Warmoth government in Louisiana, and similar acts. These were "subtle, insidious usurpations of power and the unseen and covert attacks of political chicanery" which might at some other time be perpetrated in Northern states, to spell the doom of republican institutions in the Union.[28] Two years later he exposed more of the results of reconstruction when he assured the House that because of the condition of the "prostrate Southern states, there was no possible need to consider that they might regain national power. In fact, so far from ruling the interests of other sections, they are impotent to protect a single interest or right of their own."[29] The Freedman's Bureau was, he contended, the greatest divisive force, setting race against race, so that "the very first principle of government which your new-made citizen saw in operation was the principle of race discrimination. . . ."[30] The whites were effectively disfranchised by the carpet-bag governments, which were kept in power by Federal troops. Lamar's final plea to the House was to "give them local self-government, and you will see at last what will be the dawn of prosperity in all the industries and enterprises of the North; you will see, sir, a true Southern renaissance, a real grand reconstruction of the South."[31]

When he spoke at Mississippi City in 1878, Jefferson Davis was not prepared even to concede that the war had settled the question of Federal supremacy. In response to the presentation of a certificate of membership in the Army of Tennessee, he observed that their kinship lay in defeat, but that he would die as he had lived, "firm in the State rights faith."[32] He conceded that the South had agreed to return to the Union and abide by the Constitution, but he urged resistance to the reconstruction governments because the oaths did "not require you to accept a fraud in the title to office, nor, because a man calls himself a 'statesman,' to admit his right to legitimize bribery and perjury."[33]

At the 1874 reunion of the Richmond Light Infantry Blues, General Wise once again commented on the sad situation into which his state and his old colleagues in arms had fallen. After reminiscing about their great gallantry and some of the incidents of their battles, he concluded, "Alas! the State herself, for which our noble martyrs fought or fell, or bled, or bore the miseries of Bull-pen prisons, is herself no more." The great State of Virginia, which had given leaders to the nation, and led other states throughout their history "was extinguished by the shock of a civil war, which she in vain struggled to avert, and which she was compelled to meet, as she did, in defense of her sovereign rights and independence." The Richmond Light Infantry Blues, he added, must keep up the great traditions, since they were the only armed forces left to the state; this challenge reflected the fear and mistrust Wise still felt toward the North. He followed his ex-President in continued opposition to those who wrought havoc in his state.[34]

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 669.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 686.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 692.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 687.
[32] Rowland, ed., III, 229.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 274.
[34] Henry A. Wise, *R. L. I. Blues. Speech of Gen. H. A. Wise, War Roll, Roll of Honorary Members, and the Present Roll of the Company* (Richmond, 1874), p. 13.

Jabez L. M. Curry, who had been serving his second term as Congressman from Alabama at the time of secession, appeared occasionally during the war as a lecturer in benefit gatherings for Southern soldiers. The Richmond *Dispatch* reported one such speech on "The Two Wants of the Confederacy," in 1862. These, Curry held, were "a just appreciation of the origin and nature of the present crisis, and of our political condition, and an enlarged and true statesmanship, to effect the promotion and maintenance of our institutions." In developing the second point, Curry indicated the interest which later led him to become an ordained minister, as he emphasized the need for true statesmen to have not only mental power and administrative tact, "but a pure moral character, chastened and elevated by religious faith." Without these crowning qualities, a man could not be a statesman, Curry concluded; he could only be a politician.[35] Turning after the war, to the ministry and to education, Curry became in 1880 the administrator of the Peabody education fund. He promoted education for both Negroes and whites, and proved a persuasive and capable campaigner in all the legislatures throughout the South.

For the first few years after the war, Judah P. Benjamin was occupied in studying to be admitted as a barrister in his newly adopted country, England. Benjamin had built up a dislike for the North over a long period of time. He fled from Northern victory, and in 1875 he told a group of Southern admirers in Liverpool that he had left the South because he had seen the Abolitionists at work in starting the war, and realized that they would bring hardship to the South which he would have no power to prevent.[36] Therefore he chose to study and practice law in England, where he became highly successful. He pleaded several cases arising from maritime claims of the war, cases that enabled him to keep in contact with his first country, the South.

Joseph E. Brown, wartime governor and stormy petrel from Georgia, was not so faithful to his earlier principles. In 1880 he moved back into the political arena in the senatorial campaign against General Lawton, who, with his chief backer, Robert Toombs, attacked Brown mercilessly on his various stands during the war and reconstruction. Brown, replying to their charges in a campaign speech, noted that Toombs himself had stood with Brown on the question of troops for the defense of the state, as had Stephens. He maintained that the vote of the army had re-elected him in 1863, and that his stand on reconstruction had not only been misrepresented, but was shared by many others. He asserted that he had accepted the reconstruction measures in 1868 "because there was no way to get rid of them, not because [he] approved of them." He read a letter from General Lee, the idol of all the South, expressing the same sentiments at the same time. Finally, changing the focus from the past to the future, he assumed the garb of the pacificator: "Let the old Whig and Democratic issues, the secesssion and Union issues, and the reconstruction issues and all the past bitterness and difference of opinion be buried; and let us all unite and move forward harmoniously in the new era as citizens of the new South for the promotion of the good of the whole country."[37]

Ultimately, this was the note which even the most reluctant of the Southern

[35] Richmond *Dispatch*, February 17, 1862.

[36] Robert Douthat Meade, *Judah P. Benjamin, Confederate Statesman* (New York, 1943), pp. 361-362.

[37] Fielder, pp. 543-545.

orators sounded. Twenty-three years passed before Jefferson Davis, most irreconcilable of the traditional Southern leaders, could bring himself to speak out for cooperation with the North and an attitude of national, rather than sectional feeling. Only in 1888, at the very end of his life, did Davis' words show these signs of mollification. Addressing the young men in his audience at Mississippi City as "friends," because "the laws of the United States no longer permit me to designate you as fellow citizens," Davis confessed that his ambition lay "buried in the grave of the Confederacy." "The past is dead," he admonished, "let it bury its dead, its hopes and its aspirations. . . ." He urged them to look to the bright future of their country, and "lay aside all rancor, all bitter sectional feeling, and to make your places in the ranks of those who will bring about a consummation devoutly to be wished—a reunited country."[38]

The reality of defeat, the greater caution that comes with advancing age, and the growth of a new generation of leaders and followers caused these men who had participated in creating the tradition of Southern sectionalism to relent. They were, after all, men of words, and the eloquence of the Southern spokesmen was not long concealed. They found new ways and words to make old principles sound like new solutions; and as they had once aroused the "slumbering masses" to deeds of valor, they now led their people to accept a new state of affairs. Much of Southern life and culture was lost in the war fires they had kindled, but the traditions of Southern oratory remained.

[38] Rowland, ed., X, 47-48.

COMMENTARIES

SPEAKING TO A SOUTHERN AUDIENCE

To make a speech to this audience was not too difficult a thing. You came to attention and said, "Comrades of my father," and the crowd would cheer for two minutes, more or less, and the massed bands behind you on the platform would blare forth with bars of "Maryland, My Maryland," or "Swanee River," or, as in this case, "My Old Kentucky Home." You ended a paragraph on the name of Robert E. Lee. (Great and prolonged applause, with appropriate music: "Old Virginny, Never Tire.") Another paragraph to introduce the name of Wade Hampton and up and down the aisle the South Carolina camps would be putting on an impromptu parade, with stiff jig steps interpolated. And so on and so forth. And when you reached your peroration and topped it off with a reference to "the Lost Cause which could never be lost so long as Americans reverence valor and devotion"—well, you got no further than that because a thousand cracked old voices, wispy but defiant, would give the Rebel Yell, and some folks would cry and some would stand up on their chairs and, with catches in their throats, try to cheer; and the bands would play "Dixie"—it couldn't be anything but "Dixie" now. Perhaps to an alien it might have been all pretty silly and banal and dripping with the saccharin syrups of a vain bathos, but for these tottery old gaffers and the white-haired grannies who sat with some of them, and to their children and even to their children's children, the clanging years were turned back like a page and the vanished legions marched again and Johnnie was gone for a soger!—Irvin S. Cobb, *Exit Laughing* (Indianapolis, 1941), p. 330. Quoted by permission of the publishers, The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

THE PLACE OF ORATORY IN AMERICAN LITERATURE

Barnet Baskerville

THE 1952 presidential campaign was marked not only by an intense interest in the subject matter of some of the speeches given, but also by speculation concerning their stylistic qualities and the possibility of their enduring as part of our literature. Early in the campaign Howard K. Smith reported from London that the British people were delighted and captivated by the speeches of the Democratic candidate, a man almost completely unknown to them, because of his distinguished use of the English language. In the weeks which followed, Governor Stevenson was proclaimed by enthusiastic supporters as the greatest literary stylist in public life since Woodrow Wilson, and his utterances were compared favorably with those of a previous resident of Springfield, Abraham Lincoln.

It has been a long time since Americans in any great number have given much attention to the question of the relationship, if any, between literature and oratory. But it is an old, old, question upon which students of rhetoric have frequently been moved to ponder. During the last three or four decades rhetoricians have tended to emphasize the differences rather than the similarities between imaginative "literature" and purposive, functional "rhetoric," and a generation ago Professor Wichelns pointed out the dangers of "The Literary Criticism of Oratory." But an awareness of the difference in intent between the maker of speeches and the writer of poetry or fiction need not obscure the fact that speeches have, now and then, been included in collections of essays, poems, stories, and similar imaginative writings considered to have permanent literary value. Oratory, then, does apparently sometimes become literature.

Which orators have been admitted to the pages of literature is an intriguing question. In the course of a study of American criticism of oratory, this writer has examined thirty-two histories and twenty-two anthologies of American literature in an attempt to discover what literary men have had to say about orators and oratory. This paper is not concerned with a description of the criticism itself but with a by-product of the study which seems worth reporting, namely, an account of which speakers appear most frequently in works devoted to recording the history of our literature, and of which speeches are tacitly acknowledged as "literature" by virtue of being included in literary anthologies. Such an accounting may come no nearer an answer to the question of what *should be* the place of the orator in literature, but it will provide an indication of what that place *is* and *has been*.

Let us begin with the histories.[1] The literary historian faces a number of vex-

Barnet Baskerville (Ph.D., Northwestern University, 1948) is Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Washington. *This article is based on a paper delivered at the annual convention of the Speech Association of America in Cincinnati, December, 1952.*

[1] The conclusions reached in this paper are based upon an examination of the following histories of American literature: Abernethy, Julian W., *American Literature* (1903); Angoff, Charles, *A Literary History of the American People* (1935); Bates, Katherine Lee, *American*

ing problems, of which not the least is the formulation of a workable definition of literature itself. A perusal of the prefaces of these works discloses numerous definitions ranging from the very catholic to the very exclusive. Generally speaking, they represent various mid-positions on a continuum extending between the narrow concept of literature as *belles-lettres* and the broad concept of literature as the written record of the life of a people.

A second problem is that of selectivity —which authors are to be included and which omitted. The two problems are obviously closely related, for one's conception of literature serves as a primary basis of selection. Hence, the historian of *belles-lettres* might be expected to pass by sermons, letters, political speeches, and documents which would seem indispensable to one who regarded literature as a reflection of the national mind. In general, the tendency of most American literary historians seems to be in the direction of as liberal a construction of the term *literature* as the limitations of space permit.

Our examination of thirty-two representative histories of American literature reveals the names of more than a score of men whose fame rests in large measure upon their speaking rather than their writing. Ten of these are discussed in varying detail in more than half the works studied. Firmly established at the head of the list is Daniel Webster, who is given a place in literature by more than two-thirds of the historians. Webster is closely followed by James Otis, Abraham Lincoln, John C. Calhoun, Edward Everett, Patrick Henry, and Jonathan Edwards,[2] all of whom receive about the same amount of attention. Next in favor are Charles Sumner, Henry Clay, Wendell Phillips, and Sam Adams. Rufus Choate and Josiah Quincy are treated by approximately one third of the writers, and a dozen other speakers are mentioned less than half-a-dozen times.

Two rather significant generalizations may be made concerning this treatment of orators in literary history. The first is that (with very few exceptions) the speakers mentioned fall into two groups —the pre-Revolutionary orators, and the mid-nineteenth-century orators. In fact, it was long standard practice to include in the chapters on the Revolutionary Period and the period of the New England Renaissance, sections simply entitled "The Orators." But one finds no such sections in chapters dealing with later nineteenth- or early twentieth-

Literature (1898); Blankenship, Russell, *American Literature As An Expression of the National Mind* (1935); Boynton, Percy H., *Literature and American Life* (1936); Bronson, Walter C., *A Short History of American Literature* (1919); Cairns, William B., *A History of American Literature* (1912); Hawthorne, Julian and Leonard Lemmon, *American Literature* (1895); Leisy, Ernest, *American Literature, An Interpretative Survey* (1929); Long, Wm. J., *American Literature* (1913); Matthews, Brander, *Introduction to the Study of American Literature* (1896); Newcomer, Alphonse G., *American Literature* (1902); Pace, Roy B., *American Literature* (1915); Pancoast, Henry S., *An Introduction to American Literature* (1898); Parrington, V. L., *Main Currents in American Thought*, 3 vols. (1927-30); Pattee, Fred L., *A History of American Literature* (1897), *A History of American Literature Since 1870* (1915), *The First Century of American Literature, 1770-1870* (1935); Quinn, Arthur H., *The Literature of the American People* (1951); Richardson, Charles F., *American Literature 1607-1885* (1888); Sears, Lorenzo, *American Literature in the Colonial and National Periods* (1909); Simonds, Wm. E., *A Student's History of American Literature* (1909); Spiller, Robert E., *et al.*, *Literary History of the United States*, 3 vols. (1948); Smyth, Albert H., *American Literature* (1891); Taylor, Walter F., *A History of American Letters* (1936); Trent, Wm. P., *A History of American Literature 1607-1865* (1903); Trent, Wm. P., *et al.*, *The Cambridge History of American Literature*, 4 vols. (1917-21); Tyler, Moses Coit, *The Literary History of the American Revolution, 1763-1783* (1897); Ward, Alfred C., *American Literature 1880-1930* (1932); Wendell, Barrett, *A Literary History of America* (1901); Whipple, Edwin P., *American Literature* (1887).

[2] Edwards, it is true, is more often presented as philosopher or autobiographer than as speaker.

century literature. Post-Civil War speakers are almost completely ignored. We are not entirely unprepared, therefore, for the discovery that two books, entitled *American Literature 1880-1930*,[3] and *A History of American Literature Since 1870*,[4] fail to mention any speakers at all. One is forced to the conclusion either that oratory suddenly ceased with the Civil War or that it was no longer of such a nature as to interest the literary historian. Readers familiar with the speeches of Grady, Ingersoll, Bryan, Beveridge, Wilson, or Roosevelt may wonder why they are considered less "literary" than, say, the speeches of James Otis or Henry Clay.

The second generalization is that during the last twenty years the tendency to de-emphasize the orators in the writing of American literary history has been clearly apparent. In fact, this writer has discovered only one history of literature published since 1930 in which speakers or speaking have any appreciable part. Evidence of this lessened emphasis upon orators is abundant. Albert Smyth, writing in 1891, discusses thirteen speakers in his tiny book of only 164 pages, giving Webster more space than Mark Twain, Melville, or Lanier, and about the same amount as Thoreau.[5] Ludwig Lewisohn in 1939 pauses only long enough to sneer at Webster's "endless rhetoric" and to commend him solely for the lines to his dead son.[6] Apparently Webster, "literature" in 1891, was no longer "literature" in 1939.

Conceivably, the implication is simply that Smyth and Lewisohn had different literary tastes, and would have made the same selections even if the dates of their books had been reversed. It is interesting, therefore, to turn to two histories written by the same man, Fred Lewis Pattee —one in 1897, the other in 1935—to see if any change in attitude can be discerned.

In his earlier book,[7] Professor Pattee includes in his chapter on "The Revolutionary Period" a discussion of Sam Adams, Otis, Henry, and Quincy. Webster, Choate, Clay, Calhoun, and Everett are presented in the inevitable chapter on "The Orators." Pattee comments upon the power of Webster's printed speeches to re-create the thrill and excitement of the original occasion, and observes that "It is this that brings the work of Webster into the realm of pure literature."[8] Although he thinks Garrison's speeches as dead as the issues that called them forth, he nevertheless asserts that "Garrison will ever hold a high place in the history of American thought and literature."[9] We learn further that "the orations of Sumner are an addition to American literature only less important than the work of Webster, Choate, and Everett."[10]

In the light of these statements, the complete omission of the orators in Pattee's later book,[11] in which he covers much the same period, is astonishing. Instead, there are chapters on "The Annuals and Gift Books" and "The Magazinists." Webster, Garrison, Sumner, and others who less than forty years before had been assured of literary immortality did not merit the briefest mention in the later history of American literature.[12]

[3] A. C. Ward, *American Literature 1880-1930* (London, 1932).

[4] F. L. Pattee, *A History of American Literature Since 1870* (New York, 1915).

[5] A. H. Smyth, *American Literature* (Philadelphia, 1891).

[6] Ludwig Lewisohn, *The Story of American Literature* (New York, 1939), pp. 49-50.

[7] F. L. Pattee, *A History of American Literature* (New York, 1897).

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 326.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 329-330.

[11] F. L. Pattee, *First Century of American Literature, 1770-1870* (New York, 1935).

[12] Between the two volumes mentioned Pattee wrote *The Development of the American*

The one notable exception to this pronounced tendency toward the de-emphasis or complete omission of speakers is the monumental *Literary History of the United States*,[13] a three-volume work published in 1948 under the editorship of Robert E. Spiller and others. These remarkable volumes, the work of a distinguished group of collaborators from several academic areas, once again introduce the separate chapter on "The Orators." Two of the three co-authors of this chapter, Harold F. Harding and Everett Lee Hunt, are rhetorical rather than literary critics. It will be interesting to observe whether the section on orators will become an established part of future histories of literature, and if so whether rhetoricians will be invited to write it.

Let us turn now to the anthologies of American literature[14] to see which speeches have been and are being presented along with essays, stories, poems, and other literary forms for study in our colleges and universities. Noticeable first is that Daniel Webster, whose place in literature was supposed to have been securely established, is scarcely represented at all. His "Bunker Hill Address" is included in only four of the twenty-two anthologies examined, the "Reply to Hayne" in only three. Abraham Lincoln appears to be king of the anthologies, as Webster is king of the histories. As might perhaps have been expected, his "Gettysburg Address" leads all the rest with sixteen "votes." Next come the "Second Inaugural" and Emerson's Phi Beta Kappa oration "The American Scholar," both of which appear in thirteen anthologies. Other speeches most frequently included are:

4. Jefferson's "First Inaugural Address" (9)
5. Henry's "Call to Arms" (9)
6. Lincoln's "Farewell to Springfield" (9)
7. Edwards' "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God" (8)
8. Lincoln's "First Inaugural Address" (7)
9. Washington's "Farewell Address" (6)
10. Emerson's "Divinity School Address" (5)

The list could be extended to include twenty-five or thirty more speeches, each of which is considered important by only one or two anthologists. Of the three speeches included by a majority of

Short Story (1923), in which he discussed among other things the annuals, the lady's books, and the journalization of the short story. It is understandable that some of this material should have been incorporated into his later history. Yet this fact does not explain his complete omission of oratory from that work.

[13] Robert Spiller, *et al.*, *Literary History of the United States*, 3 vols. (New York, 1948).

[14] The following anthologies were consulted: Benet, W. R. and Norman H. Pearson, *The Oxford Anthology of American Literature* (1938); Blair, Walter, Theodore Hornberger, and Randall Stewart, *The Literature of the United States* (1949); Calhoun, Mary E. and Emma L. MacAlarney, *Readings From American Literature* (1915); Cargill, Oscar, *American Literature: A Period Anthology*, 5 vols. (1933); Cleveland, Charles D., *Compendium of American Literature* (1859); Davis, Joe Lee, John T. Frederick, and Frank L. Mott, *American Literature*, 2 vols. (1948); Duyckinck, E. A. and George L. Duyckinck, *Cyclopaedia of American Literature*, 2 vols. (1877); Ellis, Milton, Louise Pound, George W. Spohn, Frederick J. Hoffman, *A College Book of American Literature* (1949); Foerster, Norman, *American Poetry and Prose*, 3rd ed. (1947); Hubbell, Jay B., *American Life in Literature* (1936); Jones, Howard M., and Ernest E. Leisy, *Major American Writers* (1952); McDowell, Tremaine, *America in Literature* (1944); Newcomer, Alphonse G., Alice E. Andrews, and Howard J. Hall, *Three Centuries of American Poetry and Prose* (1917); Pace, Roy Bennett, *American Literature* (1915); Pattee, F. L., *Century Readings for a Course in American Literature* (1926); Payne, Leonidas W., Jr., *American Literary Readings* (1917); Quinn, Arthur H., Albert C. Baugh, and Will David Howe, *The Literature of America* (1929); Shafer, Robert, *American Literature* (1926); Simpson, Claude M. and Allan Nevins, *The American Reader* (1941); Stedman, Edmund C., and Ellen M. Hutchinson, *The Library of American Literature*, 11 vols. (1888); Thorp, Willard, Merle Curti, and Carlos Baker, *American Issues*, 2 vols. (1941); Van Doren, Carl and Mark Van Doren, *A History of American and British Literature Since 1890* (1925).

the anthologists, two are by Lincoln. Of the top ten, four are Lincoln's.

An inclination on the part of literary historians to slight post-Civil War speakers has already been noted, and the same tendency is apparent among the anthologists. As a matter of fact, in twenty-two anthologies, some of which run well over a thousand pages, one finds only five later nineteenth-century speeches, no one of which appears more than three times. There are practically no twentieth-century speeches, Wilson's "Declaration of War Against Germany" and his speech to the Senate on "The Conditions of the Peace" being the only ones presented more than once. The implied judgment of the literary historians that oratory of literary significance stopped with the Civil War seems, therefore, to receive the tacit corroboration of the anthologists.

Moreover, the later anthologies, like the later histories, appear less and less willing to admit oratory to their pages. This tendency is dramatically illustrated by a contrast between one of the earliest works, Stedman and Hutchinson's eleven volume *Library of American Literature* (1888),[15] and one of the latest, Jones and Leisy's *Major American Writers* (1952).[16] Stedman and Hutchinson include excerpts from one hundred and nine orations; Jones and Leisy include *nine*, of which six are by Lincoln. The earlier work is much larger, and by present standards almost completely uncritical in its selection. But the fact that it contains more items under "oratory" than under "biography," "criticism," "drama," or "essays," suggests the relative importance given to speeches.

Finally, the lack of agreement on a definition of the term *literature* is manifested also by the editors of literary anthologies. The distinction between "pure literature" and literature in its broader sense, which would include the so-called utilitarian types, is constantly in evidence in their prefaces. The attitude of most editors seems to be something like this: "We acknowledge the existence of two kinds of literature (once distinguished by DeQuincey as the 'literature of knowledge' and the 'literature of power') and although our primary interest is in the latter, or 'pure literature,' we are attempting to bring you the finest examples of both kinds." But the reader is seldom told in which category a given piece of writing belongs, although the tacit assumption appears to be that oratory is not often to be regarded as pure literature.

Some light was shed on this question with the publication in 1941 of *American Issues*,[17] a two-volume anthology by Thorp, Curti, and Baker. This work is described as the first anthology to make "adequate critical distinction between selections whose bearing and interest are primarily social, and selections which can stand on their own merits as literature."[18] Volume One is entitled "The Social Record," and contains literature which elucidates the dominant issues at work in American society. Volume Two, "The Literary Record," is reserved for works of genuine literary art. Of it the editors say: "We have aimed to include . . . only such writing as can honestly be said to show the artist's hand at work, consciously shaping his material."[19] We discover that Volume One contains an excellent selection of speeches—thirty-two in all—from Henry's "Call to Arms" to Franklin Roosevelt's "First Inaugu-

[15] E. C. Stedman and E. M. Hutchinson, *A Library of American Literature*, 11 vols. (New York, 1888).

[16] H. M. Jones and E. E. Leisy, *Major American Writers* (New York, 1952).

[17] Willard Thorp, Merle Curti, and Carlos Baker, *American Issues*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1941).

[18] *Ibid.*, "Foreword," v.

[19] *Ibid.*

ral." We then turn eagerly to Volume Two to find which American speeches "show the artist's hand at work, consciously shaping his material." There are two: Edwards' "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," and Emerson's "American Scholar." Webster is not there; Jefferson is not there. Even Lincoln is not there, although the editors speak in the first volume of "his ability to rise to poetic heights of feeling and expression in his idiomatic and terse prose."[20] If the judgment of Thorp, Curti, and Baker is to be accepted, the only public addresses in 300 years of American history having enduring artistic and literary merit are the utterances of a colonial preacher and a New England essayist.

Our survey of American literary histories and anthologies appears to justify the following conclusions:

1. The works examined manifest vagueness and uncertainty concerning the scope of the term *literature*. A distinction between artistic and utilitarian writing is generally recognized, although little attempt is made in the anthologies to classify material in these categories.
2. Although numerous speakers and speeches are included, only a relatively small group receive the attention of the majority of writers.
3. There is a remarkable lack of interest in post-Civil War oratory.
4. There is a clearly observable tendency on the part of the more recent writers, particularly during the last twenty-five years, toward a de-emphasis or outright omission of orators and oratory.

[20] *Ibid.*, I, 547.

This last-named phenomenon, the gradual fading of oratory from the pages recording the national literature, invites further investigation and interpretation. Why, we are prompted to ask, should this be so? Is it because of changed attitudes toward oratory, or toward literature, or both? Is it because of the lowered status of the orator in our national life? Is it that the burgeoning of *belles-lettres* during the last half-century has simply crowded oratory off the page? Or is it possible that the emergence of Speech as a separate discipline has provided the literary historian and anthologist with a welcome opportunity to relegate the literature of speech to those who are willing and able to give it more specialized treatment—much as dramatic literature has been entrusted more and more to the care of those whose principal interest is in the drama? Whatever the cause, the orator, once welcomed proudly and unquestioningly, is undoubtedly losing—indeed seems already to have lost—his place in American literature.

COMMENTARIES

THE FIERY LIFE OF THE MOMENT

. . . If you would lift me, you must be on higher ground. If you would liberate me, you must be free. If you would correct my false view of facts,—hold up to me the same facts in the true order of thought, and I cannot go back from the new conviction.

The power of Chatham, of Pericles, of Luther, rested on this strength of character, which, because it did not and could not fear anybody, made nothing of their antagonists, and became sometimes exquisitely provoking and sometimes terrific to these.

We are slenderly furnished with anecdotes of these men, nor can we help ourselves by those heavy books in which their discourses are reported. Some of them were writers, like Burke; but most of them were not, and no record at all adequate to their fame remains. Besides, what is best is lost, the fiery life of the moment. . . .—Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Eloquence."

A REPORT ON ENGLISH IN EUROPE

W. Cabell Greet

PERHAPS the most interesting and rewarding of British language studies today are those of the Place-Name Society. In that enterprise, two of the moving spirits are Sir Frank Stenton, the historian of Anglo-Saxon England, whose name is pronounced *Stanton* [stæntn] by the two premier professors of Anglo-Saxon—Wrenn of Oxford and Bruce Dickens of Cambridge—and Stenton's successor in the Place-Name Society, Hugh Smith, the Quain Professor of English at University College, London.

Since the larger-place names have been used up by the mill of the Society, the smaller places are now providing grist. A study is presently in progress on field names in a corner of Gloucester. An occasional field name or small-place name is familiar in this country—Skunk Hollow, Jackson's Woodlot, Charlie's Brook—but few here are so tenacious and complex as English field names, for example: The Cuckold's Knap (pronounced Coocoo's), Ram Acre (politely pronounced "Rum Acre"), and a half-acre plot of land called Hundred Acres.

The United States exists in time whereas England, at least to Englishmen, is time. In *Mr. Weston's Good Wine* the old man says: "Time be stopped; Eternity have begun." In this eternity, which is England and the English language, place-name study is coextensive and congenial. Moreover, it provides the phonetician with limitless materials illustrating Harry Ayres's law for English phonology: everything that can happen did happen and does happen.

English scholars are not happy in dialect surveys, which, insofar as pronunciation is concerned, ask for location of the pervasive, the spotting of what is adrift. Isoglosses and splotches of overlaying water-colors might be the convenient ways of indicating visually such phenomena as:

(1) wrong, pronounced in southern Yorkshire [raŋ], [rɔŋ], [ruŋ], and [reŋ]; and

(2) the occurrence of [iə] for many Middle English vowels in the Beverley, Yorkshire, area.

Additional laws such as Orton's "Similar sounds do not necessarily suffer similar changes" appear for example in the Beverley area, where the mare's *foal* is pronounced [fiəl], but *bone* is pronounced [buən] quite as often as [biən]. A second law or caution may be called the rural lag: any local usage is as likely to reflect metropolitan or London fashion of three-score years past as the ancient neighborhood dialect.

As a way of solving the problems of presenting so many data, the suggestion has been seriously advanced that the idea of separate maps be abandoned, and that each item of information be listed with an indication of its latitude and longitude on what is called in England the grid system of the ordnance maps. On the basis of this information, students of the present and future gen-

W. Cabell Greet, for many years editor of American Speech, *is professor of English at Barnard College, Columbia University. He spent the year 1950-51 as Fulbright lecturer at the Universities of Montpellier and Aix-en-Provence, France. He was Guggenheim Fellow in 1952. He traveled widely, lecturing at Oslo and Vienna, and advocating always American studies and American speech.*

erations, buying their own outline maps, could with great satisfaction draw graphs or glosses of every conceivable sort.

There are now two centers of the Dialect Survey. One is at the University of Leeds under the direction of Professor Harold Orton of Leeds and Professor Eugen Dieth of Zurich, a remarkable Swiss dialectian who spends all his spare moments in England. The other center, at the University of Edinburgh, is directed by Professor Angus McIntosh. Different methods are followed by the two centers, and whether the results will be easily comparable remains to be seen. The Leeds work is getting on faster than that at Edinburgh.[1]

The lack of any well-organized, single dialect survey of England is regrettable. Between the wars the idea was often discussed in the Philological Society; particularly the proposal of Hugh Smith in the early thirties was sufficiently detailed to have won support, but it was not adopted. Perhaps the English imagination was at fault. V. S. Pritchett recently wrote in the *New York Times* in an essay on Eliot: "The English imagination . . . , as a rule, is hostile to intellectual formalizations and is lazy, sociable, sensual and heretical. Even the English feeling for tradition is a feeling for the history of its heresies." Pritchett adds that in literature T. S. Eliot and Henry James "have given the sharp call to order." Perhaps British dialect study might be further advanced if Hans Kurath, aided by American foundation money, could have given the sharp call to order!

Perhaps the refusal of British scholars to organize for a linguistic atlas had a sound reason in the complexity of the material, the imponderables, the unmappables. Moreover, a strong feeling that only the local inhabitant knows the dialect seems to exist; this notion is like H. C. Wyld's dictionary-preface that Standard English is the natural speech of country families and is unteachable to city folk, Americans, and other foreigners. The English dialect field worker today turns pale and is silent when his critic says, "That informant must have been pulling your leg. I was born only five miles away and still spend my holidays there, and that word—or that pronunciation—of yours, would make the villagers laugh."

Thus the reason no uniform atlas project has materialized may have been too much, rather than too little, interest in dialects. In any case the British devoted their attention to the making of dictionaries and the studying of words, names, and grammar. They have excelled in the perfect tense, the present viewed as a part of the past. Americans tend to replace the perfect tense with past emphatic, or, in dialect surveys, with the present. When the British treat present usage, it is from the connoisseur's point of view, as in Fowler's *Dictionary of Modern English Usage* or Carey's *Mind the Stop*—an essay on punctuation that, like Fowler, becomes a guide and inspirer to good writing. It is not a hopeful sign for the English dialect survey that when the British have tried their hands at other foreign devices such as, for example, the American freshman handbook, they have missed the boat of sense and sensibility.

The Philological Society is now sponsoring the two dialect projects—Leeds and Edinburgh—and has recommended, without much success so far, that other universities and colleges sponsor similar dialect studies. These studies also are free of central authority. Graduate students undertake intensive local studies,

[1] Copies of the Leeds questionnaire are available at a small charge from the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society in care of Professor Orton.

usually introduced and sponsored by a professor who knows the village.

At the recent London meeting of the International Congress of Linguists the representative of the Philological Society commented that American graduate students would be welcomed as aids in the dialect surveys. Undoubtedly the experience would be interesting and profitable for an American student even if he required two years for gathering enough data and experience at Leeds or Edinburgh to put together an American dissertation. One year, however, was enough for one American student, George Waldo, with an intensive village project under the fine tutelage of Professor Hugh Smith, University College, London. Americans would probably find equally kind and efficient reception at any of the universities in England, Ireland, or Scotland, though arrangements have to be made in advance.

A village project would be especially suitable for a Fulbright fellow. There would be little danger of his getting lost and, for lack of supervision, wasting his time. No one interested should hesitate to write to Professors Ross of Birmingham, N. Davis of Glasgow, Potter of Liverpool, Brook of Manchester, C. L. Wrenn or J. A. W. Bennett of Oxford. Several excellent men can be listed in Ireland: Professor J. J. Hogan at the Irish National University in Dublin and F. W. Baxter at Queens, Belfast. For information about the Linguistic Survey of Scotland and the interesting new School of Scottish Studies, inquiry should be made of Professor Angus McIntosh, Minto House, Edinburgh.

Concerning the teaching of English to foreigners, divergent theories and practice remain about as they were at the time of the Carnegie Conference early in the thirties. At the International Conference of University Professors of English, held at Oxford in 1950, I did not hear the name *Basic-English* mentioned once, though a session was devoted to the teaching of English as a foreign language, a session more or less under the auspices of the British Council, which is really an educational department of the British Foreign Office. There were a dozen professors from outlying posts of the Council. It seems that the sale of Basic to her Majesty's government meant a lessening of activity, if not quietus.

The next meeting of the *International Conference of University Professors of English* will be held at Cambridge the summer of 1956. The Association has had difficulty in determining what American teachers are eligible. The classification *University Professor of English* means one thing in the United States and another in all the rest of the world. The Committee invited departments of English in American Universities each to send a representative to the Paris Conference of 1953. How the invitations are issued is not completely clear, but Professor D. C. Allen of Hopkins and Dr. Louis Wright of the Folger Library are members of the International Committee and should be able at least to forward requests for information. Although the procedure seems uncertain and is indeed quite different from the way scholarly gatherings are managed in this country, it is less difficult than getting a ticket for the President's Inaugural Ball or for the Queen's Coronation, and is likely to be more fun for professors.

Although American language studies may stir a degree of interest in the British,[2] the feeling about American language is not elsewhere friendly. Except in Istanbul, no academic interest in

[2] Even a week's visit at an English college can buoy up the soul of an American academic mouse. English dons exhale confidence like a Rotary Club.

American English is apparent, and this statement puts mildly the hostility that European teachers of English feel towards it. From Greece to Spain, from Italy to Sweden, a shade of amusement, dislike, or surprise passes over the academic brow when American speech is mentioned even casually. A possible exception is in England: the British are determined to get along with Americans. They believe that America is indispensable to them in the new world and they are prepared to accept even the language, so far as necessary, though it must be a bitter pill. The home of the lost cause of Oxford English is not Oxford but Europe; bumptious exemplars abound in every continental university. Sweden and Denmark seemed particularly uninterested in American speech and literature. Obviously, local academic politics always influences attitudes with little or no reference to international considerations. The curriculums are crowded, and the admission of American studies means a diminution of the students in and the importance of some other study.

Ironically enough, European teachers mean by "Standard English speech" the textbooks of Daniel Jones and his remarkable colleagues in University College a generation and more ago. Oldsters remember with amusement how all British professors of English literature and language belabored and snubbed that little group of phoneticians and speech teachers at University College; the present European university professors made their English journeys to sit at the feet, not of Jones, but of his critics and enemies. Yet today the bulwark of Wyld's position, and of many another conservative's, is Jones, simply because Jones is in the textbooks and his students, now matured, are in charge today of the departments of phonetics in British universities, attended by the young fry of the continent.

What can be the reason for this expressed dislike of American English even when it is absurd? It is absurd, for example, when European listeners disqualify good American speech by saying, "Oh he—or she—doesn't talk like an American."

The reasons, perhaps, are these:

America, as the wealthy nation holding the balance of power, is the most envied and, in place of England, is now the target for all kinds of superficial abuse—superficial because beneath the envy is an admiration and a curiosity. Both the professors and the students would like to visit America, and the speech of the students is more American than their teachers admit or approve. Thus the students in English classes learn two accents: one for the classroom and one for their own use, especially when talking of American movies, folk songs, jazz, and business.

Moreover, the general attitude towards America, deep down, is friendly, as international relations go, whatever the critical press says. From the European point of view, America was the ugly duckling, but Americans were and are one of their brood. They are really proud and thankful that one of the family is strong, but they cannot love us more than they love themselves.

The second reason is that to teach American English in Europe would demand a change of texts and some new training of teachers. Teachers do not like to change. Particularly in France, the instruction in English speech is the occupation of underpaid teachers who are usually regarded as outside the line of promotion. The subject is starved; it does not attract the brilliant student or encourage innovation. The social and financial position even of professors is

debased. Once the equal of a brigadier general in protocol, the French professor today has lost a good many points in the social scale. In Spain a scholar elected to the Spanish Academy was said to have had to delay taking his seat some time before he could afford to buy or rent the costume.

The third reason is that most teachers in Europe—and here—are willing to teach only *one narrow* variety of a language, although students seem to learn a language best in an environment where several varieties are spoken. Do the small contradictions lend interest? The French teachers of French at the Institut Phonétique in Paris, for example, seem unusually successful with their students, and they are very clever at introducing acceptable variations.

The final reason, little appreciated by Americans, is that the history of the modern languages of Europe is the history of a long continuing battle for supremacy among dialects. When Americans challenge a so-called British standard, it is as if the French of Toulouse or Swiss Germans were demanding recognition in Paris or Bonn. To Europeans, American pretensions are like the Scots demanding linguistic Home Rule or the Catalonians or the Basques or the Bretons insisting that their speech ways be recognized as the equal, nay, as the superior, of present school standards in England and France. Such claims bore or amuse the average European. And when perforce they are granted, as in the extreme case of Welsh in Welsh universities and Gaelic in Ireland, the concession is for home use only. Why, Europeans wonder, should Americans expect American English to be taken seriously outside of America, if there?

The future of American English, however, need cause us no deep concern. Europeans are a canny lot. They are used to paying lip-service to Caesar. Moreover the United States is, in the main, a kindly Caesar. Europeans are not fools, but they do not want to be pushed. They will in time come to use American English, especially if their young people are invited here on fellowships, and if our young people continue to go to Europe. A young American now teaching in a girls' school in Sussex, recently reported that her students have said to her, "Please don't stop speaking American—we are trying to learn it."

COMMENTARIES

A SCOTSMAN LISTENS TO AMERICANS

. . . The inferior orders of society in America certainly speak more accurately than the inferior orders in Britain, and those local peculiarities of accent which abound so amazingly in our native country, and which a foreigner travelling among us must detect much more readily than a native, are totally unknown here. There is a great degree of uniformity in the style of conversation, throughout that portion of the country which I have visited; and a very considerable degree of what is called in Scotland the English pronunciation. . . . The educated classes of society, do not speak by any means so accurately in America as in Britain; there are more deficiencies in grammar, in accent, in pronunciation; there is a mixture of unauthorized phrases of which we know nothing; and were a casual conversation between a well educated native of America, and a well educated native of Britain, faithfully committed to writing, that of the American, would I think in a large majority of cases be found deficient.—John M. Duncan, *Travels through Part of the United States and Canada in 1818 and 1819* (Glasgow, 1823), Vol. II, p. 306.

AUSTRALIAN SPEECH

Clive Sansom

BEFORE discussing the type of speech used by Australians and comparing it with that of English and American speakers, it may be well to consider briefly their social and historical backgrounds.

Britain was first "colonized" several thousand years ago. Britons, Romans, Angles, Saxons, Danes, Normans established themselves by conquest, besides the smaller contingents that arrived peaceably to trade or to escape from tyranny elsewhere. As a result of these invasions, followed by the isolated life of agricultural communities, dialects developed which, in the more remote parts of England, are still strongly defined. Perhaps no other country in the world can show so many variants of speech over so small an area. However, as a result of centralized government, a shift of population caused by industry, improved transport, compulsory education, and more recently by the radio, a common dialect known as "Standard English" has gradually arisen.

Not having been established deliberately, this dialect is difficult to define, but it has been loosely described as "a type of speech which may be heard without discontent from Land's End to John O'Groat's." It is thus a key to wider social understanding. There is little doubt that, after a period of bilingualism, the smaller dialects will disappear entirely or survive merely as regional coloring imposed on this general form of speech. In some ways this eventuality is to be regretted. Anyone who has heard the dialects, or even the set of records made by the British Drama League,[1] will appreciate their varied rhythms and inflections and be sorry to lose much of their vocabulary. But speech is a living thing. No form of it can be artificially preserved—except on discs. When its period of natural effectiveness is over, it dries up and passes on some of its qualities to the main stream of language that survives it. Nor is its passing entirely a matter for regret. The local dialects, interesting and beautiful as they may be, are truly effective only within their own borders. They are excellent means of communication between two speakers in the same district. Outside that district their usefulness becomes progressively less. Dialects not only confine their speakers geographically: they confine them socially. Almost every dialect in England is, in effect, a class dialect—a shibboleth that limits and perhaps frustrates its user. The extended use of Standard English may be a way of improving communication and understanding between speakers on different social levels, and another step towards the realization of that democratic ideal which Britain, in theory at least, was one of the first nations to accept.

Mr. Sansom, formerly Examiner in the Art of Spoken Language, University of London, is now Supervisor of Speech Education for the Tasmanian Education Department. His English publications include: Speech of Our Time, Speech Rhymes, Adventures in Words *(with Rodney Bennett) and* The Poet Speaks *(with Marjorie Gullan). He edited, for fifteen years, The Speech Fellowship's bulletin,* Speech News. *In 1951 his long poem* The Witnesses *received a Festival of Britain award from the Arts Council of Great Britain. A novel,* Passion Play, *was published in the United States last year by the John Day Company.*

[1] 9 Fitzroy Square, London, W. 1.

The situation in the United States has been very different. The process has been shorter, for one thing—a matter of some three hundred years—the aboriginal inhabitants having had apparently no influence on the speech of those who displaced them. But as in England, there has been the influx of widely different nationalities. Enough people of Anglo-Saxon stock came in the early days to establish English as the general language, but they were closely followed by others from almost every country in the world. Again as in England, enough time elapsed under conditions of limited transport to encourage the growth of dialects. But these (or so it appears to an outside observer) have never been social barriers to the same extent as in England, and even their geographical limits stretch over a vastly wider area.

On the other hand, the period of assimilation in the United States was not long enough for the national characteristics of the speakers to be completely absorbed, so that any form of American speech may have its Negro, Irish, Russian, and Italian variants. There must indeed be the danger of "speech pockets" to confirm and perpetuate these differences and to prevent their owners from becoming completely absorbed into the American community. If only for this reason, one imagines, some form of standard American speech is desirable—a common dialect to implement a common citizenship. The film industry is probably doing as much as educationists to encourage this development. Since the invention of talking films, producers have developed a type of speech which is widely acceptable in their own country and which, without losing its American flavor, enables the films to be heard in Canada, Britain, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and other English-speaking countries "without discontent."

How does the Australian background compare with that of England and the United States? As in many other respects, it seems to lie midway between. Australian history is even shorter than American; it covers a mere 160 years. Although Dutch and French explorers visited the continent, the British were the first settlers, and this fact determined the future language. As in America —aside from such colorful place-names as *Waga-Waga, Nubeena, Woolloomooloo,* and a few other words like *kookaburra* (laughing jackass), *kangaroo, billabong* (a dead creek), and *corroboree* (tribal meeting)—the language has not been affected by the aborigines, who were either destroyed or pushed farther and farther back into the bush. Many of the early settlers came, at the expense of the British Government, to inhabit the convict settlements established in New South Wales and Tasmania, others to take advantage of land-grants or to escape from agricultural depression. During the nineteenth century Irish and Scottish, as well as English, migrants arrived, and small groups of Germans and Scandinavians. Recently, since the last war, much larger contingents have been brought from Holland, Poland, Austria, Latvia, and other European countries—partly to fill a territory that in its present unpopulated state is an open invitation to Asian neighbors, partly to accelerate industrial expansion, partly from a genuine desire to help the dispossessed.

The preceding discussion offers a sketchy description of the comparative background to Australian speech; now for a closer inspection.

Perhaps the most curious feature to an outsider is its uniformity, at least the absence of variants belonging to

district, race, or class. The convict settlements might have been expected to produce class differences between the governing and the governed even more marked than those obtaining in Britain a century ago. But they never did. Either the convict system ended too soon, or the immigration of free settlers followed too closely at its heels. Whatever the cause, a speech developed which is democratic in the sense that it does not readily disclose the speaker's social position.

Nor, in spite of the vast distances, are there marked regional differences among the six states which, until only fifty years ago, remained unfederated. There are several possible reasons:

(1) The comparatively short period that elapsed here between the first settlement and the coming of broadcasting and quick transport.

(2) The concentration of the bulk of the population in the capital cities—Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, Hobart—and the fact that these are all on the coastline, linked by shipping.

(3) The close ties maintained by each state with Britain, despite the 12,000 miles of sea between. There was trouble at first between the colonists and some of the representatives of the home government, but never enough to disturb the sense of contact; and today, when political independence is complete, the Australian voyaging to England still talks about "going home."

Some listeners do profess to detect local accents, but they are usually people with no phonetic training who hear personal differences in one or two instances and attribute them to environment. So far no scientific examination has been made comparable to the dialect surveys in England and the United States. Recently, Professor Franklin Hunt of Hamilton College, New York, has visited the different states to take recordings. When he has had time to sort them out, he may have some interesting findings to report, but to be at all conclusive each recording would need to be accompanied by the speaker's history—his parentage, place of birth, and other places in which he has lived—for the average Australian is something of a wanderer. For practical purposes, until further evidence is forthcoming, no regional dialects may be said to exist.

Nor again are the "racial" differences discernible that might be expected from large-scale immigration. To absorb a population increase of 25 per cent in ten years is, as the Minister for Immigration put it, a monumental task; but it appears to be succeeding. A considerable amount of foreign speech is heard, especially in the larger cities. Somebody remarked in a crowded Sydney tramcar that he and the conductor were the only "dinkum Aussies." But these differences do not seem to be transmitted to the next generation. There are several possible reasons:

(1) Government training in "practical English" begins on the ships bringing the migrants to Australia, and continues in evening classes and week-end broadcasts.

(2) Most migrants want their children to become Australians.

(3) Schools are now paying attention to spoken as well as written English, and the establishment of Area Schools is discouraging the growth of "speech pockets." Visiting Tasmanian schools, I have been impressed by the way the children of migrant parents have been absorbed. Dutch and Latvian pupils can often be identified by their build, but seldom, after the first few months, by their speech.

This remarkable uniformity does not mean that no differences of speech ex-

ist. They most certainly do. But they seem to spring more from the individual character and sensitivity of the speaker than from his racial origin, class, locality, or even upbringing. Perhaps this fact is not surprising in a nation of individualists.

Professor A. G. Mitchell of the University of Sydney refers to two main types of pronunciation, which he classifies as "Educated Australian" and "Broad Australian," with a variety of accents shading into each. But even the term "Educated Australian" suggests a criterion that does not really exist, for this speech is by no means used by all educated Australians. Indeed an unusual feature of this country is that the so-called educated speech can be heard from a backwoodsman, and the broad from a doctor or university lecturer, and both types from members of the same family who have lived together in the same district and attended the same schools. The reason is that, until recently, neither parents nor teachers have concerned themselves overmuch with speech education, and in some states student-teachers still receive no training in the use of their own voices or in the techniques of speech training. Consequently the type of speech an individual acquires has probably been more a matter of personal choice in Australia than would be the case in Britain or America. But the term "Educated Australian" does suggest an ideal which Australian education is beginning to consider.

It differs from Standard English in a number of respects. These differences have been carefully analyzed by Professor Mitchell in his *Pronunciation of English in Australia*,[2] and (rather less carefully) by Sidney Baker in *Australian Pronunciation*.[3] The reader is referred to the first of these books for a detailed examination, but the following is brief summary:

Vowels. [i], [ɛ], [æ], [ɜ], [ə], [ɔ], [ɒ] are all noticeably closer than those of Standard English, the [i] being also more forward.[4] [ʌ] and [a] are so far forward that they are classifiable as front vowels. In general, the vowel-area is smaller than in Standard English; consequently the difference between vowels is rather less marked.

Diphthongs. These are naturally affected by the vowel forming the first element; there is also a tendency to lengthen slightly the second element in [aʊ] and [aɪ]. Otherwise the diphthongs of Educated Australian are not remarkably different from those of Standard English.

Spelling Pronunciations. These are more common in Australia, e.g., ['sʌbdʒɛkt] for ['sʌbdʒɪkt]; ['stɛdfaːst] for ['stɛdfəst]; and ['mʌndeɪ] for ['mʌndɪ], though the last is by no means universal. One reason for these pronunciations may be the absence of spoken models during the nineteenth century, the isolated settlers having to rely on the written word for guidance. Another cause is possibly the method of teaching reading in infant schools until recent years, where the sound and syllable were often stressed at the expense of the spoken phrase. One still hears Grade III children using ['maʊntɛɪn] for ['maʊntən], and also ['spoʊkɛn] for ['spoʊkən]. Luckily, their common sense soon encourages them to discard these pronunciations in favor of those used by adults outside school, but these

[2] A. G. Mitchell, *The Pronunciation of English in Australia* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1946).

[3] Sidney Baker, *Australian Pronunciation* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1947).

[4] The notation used is the narrow form employed by I. C. Ward in her *Phonetics of English*, so as to indicate the differences between the two main types of Australian pronunciation.

early teaching methods have undoubtedly helped to produce a false sense of the value of written English and are partly responsible for the lack of fluency in children's speech as compared with that in England.

Other Pronunciations.

(1) Australians use [aː] or [æ] in such words as *dance* and *France* where the Standard English is [dɑːns] and [frɑːns]; this habit may derive from early Irish and northern English settlers.

(2) They use [i] in place of [ɪ] in words ending with 'y," e.g., *city* becomes ['sɪti] instead of ['sɪtɪ]; *antiquity* is [æn'tɪkwəti] instead of [æn'tɪkwɪtɪ]. This habit sometimes makes it difficult for the listener to distinguish between the numbers *17* and *70*, etc., so that in reading scores and prices some radio announcers use the pronunciations ['sɛvəntaɪ] and ['eɪtaɪ] for 70 and 80.

(3) [ɒ] replaces [ɔ] in a number of *or* and *au* words, e.g., *choral* is ['kɒrəl], not ['kɔrəl]; *auction*, is ['ɒkʃən], not ['ɔkʃən]. The pronunciation ['krɔs] for *cross* (used by some public-school educated speakers in England) is unknown here, and [ɔː'streɪlɪə] immediately indicates the speaker's birthplace.

(4) [ə] replaces [ɪ] in words ending with "es," "ed," "et," and even "it," e.g.:

	English	*Australian*
houses	'haʊzɪz	'haʊzəz
climate	'klaɪmɪt	'klaɪmət
ragged	'rægɪd	'rægəd
forest	'fɒrɪst	'fɒrəst
actress	'æktrɪs	'æktrəs
witness	'wɪtnɪs	'wɪtnəs
artist	'ɑːtɪst	'aːtəst
profit	'prɒfɪt	'prɒfət

Professor Mitchell notes that, owing to this tendency, Australian speakers do not distinguish between *boxes* and *boxers;* but the present writer has noticed, among school children at least, a tendency to lengthen the last vowel in the second word, so that the pronunciation ['bɒksɜz] is not uncommon.

(5) The Australian also changes the initial syllable in such words as *because* and *debate,* making these [bi'kɒz] and [di'beit], rather than [bɪ'kɒz] and [dɪ'beɪt]. A close connection exists between this changing or slight lengthening of vowels and the use of emphasis to be considered next.

Stress. The rate of speaking is inclined to be slower here. Where the Englishman selects a few words for emphasis and allows the less important ones to take care of themselves, the Australian emphasizes more words and stresses them more evenly. As a result, words that are given their weak forms in English speech are sometimes given their strong equivalents (e.g., even [frɒm] for *from*), and [eɪ] and [ðiː] for *a* and *the* are heard, though such overstress is mainly confined to certain radio announcers who think that this habit makes for clarity. The usage may be due to the teaching methods already mentioned, which have produced an exaggerated respect for the written language. Having had a fairly thorough training in reading and writing but, until recently, little training in oral language, many people imagine that speech should conform to writing instead of realizing that the printed word is merely a rough attempt to record the spoken language in a spelling that may be 300 years out of date. The result in unpracticed speakers is a tendency toward over-emphasis, which defeats its own ends, and a lack of rhythm.

Intonation. The patterns of intonation are not strikingly different from those of Standard English, but the range of pitch is narrower. The Australian speaker has less to play with: his expression is working in a smaller field. One habit among primary school children

is to answer questions on a rising inflection, as if to imply "Am I right?" "Is that a safe guess?" It is, I must confess, a habit which I find curiously attractive and endearing.

Educated Australian speech might be classed as one form of international English, taking its place with Standard English and Received American as a style which, though it has a native coloring, is immediately acceptable in other parts of the English-speaking world. To quote the anonymous author of *The Australian Accent:*

> We arrive at the notion of a general English or a free English, an English comparatively free of local and class characteristics. At one end we have, say, the speech of the Lancashire mill-worker, of the Bronx tough guy, and of the drawling Australian bushman, all strikingly different and all very much the product of a place. At the other end we might have the educated speech of the Lancashire man, the American and the Australian. In each of them there is a local tinge, a coloring sufficient to distinguish them from one another and attach them to a place. But it is only a tinge. We get the idea of the different sorts of English speech not becoming identical as Standard English but converging to a range of general English in which the local characteristics are much less obtrusive.[5]

In Broad Australian all the tendencies noted in regard to Educated Australian are increased so far as to take it outside this range of general English. The vowel-area is even more restricted, and the diphthongs are noticeably different. For instance, [meɪk] is replaced by [mʌɪk], the novelist's representation of this word as *mike* not being strictly accurate; [soʊ] becomes [sʌʊ], or even [sæʊ]; [haɪ] tends to become [hɒɪ]; and [haʊ] becomes [hæʊ]. Spelling pronunciations are more general among broad speakers. ['frɒntɪə] and ['kɒnstəbl] may be heard for *frontier* and *constable;* and ['ænθəni] for *Anthony*. Emphasis is still more regular than in Educated Australian, and the intonation-range sometimes so narrow that, to English ears, the speaker seems to be talking in a straight line, like a line of type.

In his essay on Australian speech, Professor Mitchell is concerned almost entirely with these differences in pronunciation, but other differences deserve the study of someone who is not only a phonetician but an expert in voice production. For the further Broad Australian moves from Educated Australian the more poorly it is produced. The speaker tends to talk in his throat, and not to project his voice. His teeth are kept close together, and there is little action of the lips or soft palate. Consequently there is little oral resonance; articulation lacks clarity; and at the extreme of broadness almost all the vowels and diphthongs are nasalized. Professor Mitchell is inclined to ignore the effect on tone quality. "One form of speech," he says with the traditional objectivity of the phonetician, "cannot be proved more or less beautiful or pleasing than another." True; nor can one poem be proved more beautiful than another. But fortunately the scientific is not the only standard, and most of us are prepared to admit that the notes which Menuhin coaxes from an instrument may be superior to those created by the old man in the battered hat who stands at the theatre-queue. The reason lies partly in the inherent quality of the instrument, but mainly in the training and skill of the performer and the value he attaches to the good production of sound. In other words, there is an aesthetic as well as a phonetic standard and this is noticeably lacking in Australia. The lack is understandable in a country where, until recently, people were mainly concerned with clearing land and building homes, but it should be faced. The words which Bertrand

[5] *The Australian Accent.* Anonymous. (Tutorial Classes Department, University of Sydney, 1952.)

Russell used in a BBC broadcast are applicable to Australia:

> The lack of aesthetic sense produced by an excessive pre-occupation with utility shows also in the matter of speech. Educated people throughout Europe, and peasants on the Continent and in Scotland and Ireland, have a certain beauty of diction: language is not merely a means of communication, but a vehicle for expressing the emotions of joy or sorrow, love or hate, that are the material of poetry. Words, many of them, have beauty; they have a history, and we are, each in our own day, responsible for handing on an unimpaired tradition in diction and enunciation. It is rare to find this feeling among Americans. If you make your meaning clear, what more can be desired?[6]

This statement, no doubt, is deliberately exaggerated for its stimulating effect, but it does contain a large element of truth. Australia cannot be considered to have matured in a linguistic sense until more of her educated men and women, especially those at the training centers, take pride in speech and learn to use it well.

The work, of course, must begin in the schools, and education departments attached to the State Governments are giving increasing attention to it. The following appear to be the essential considerations, in this order:

(1) Giving children as many opportunities as possible to use speech in a variety of ways, so as to encourage confidence and fluency. Conversations, talks, and discussions on the side of oral expression; drama, reading aloud, and the group speaking of poetry on the side of interpretation. Both sides are needed, because expression cannot develop far without models for comparison and guidance.

(2) Giving children more opportunities for listening to speech: hearing children from other classes, other schools, visitors, phonograph records, radio, and the better class of film and play. The professional theatre is practically non-existent in Australia, but the standard of amateur drama is high.

(3) Encouraging a greater awareness of the listener—a corollary to the first. This principle plays a much larger part in speech education than is generally realized. Real communication is impossible without it. Incidentally, it encourages a projection of voice, a greater clarity of speech, a wider range of intonation, and a more varied use of emphasis. The speaker is learning to present his thoughts to the listener, instead of merely uttering words and allowing the listener to collect them as best he can.

(4) Voice and speech exercises: not only exercises for voice production and for lip- and tongue-agility, but also for increasing the range of pitch, and the variety of tone, pace, and emphasis, so that the speaker who wants to communicate will have the technique to do so.

(5) If possible, a type of pronunciation that approximates to Standard Australian, because this speech has a much wider radius of communication than Broad Australian, and broadcasting and transport today are continually enlarging the speaker's world. But this objective is not esssential. If the first four are carried out, they will certainly modify the less attractive features of Broad Australian, and too much insistence on pronunciation may alienate a child or draw his attention away from the wider and more important aspects of speech.

[6] "Political and Cultural Influence of the U.S.A.," December, 1949.

ON THE ACTING OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS

John Russell Brown

IT used to be possible to quote Hamlet's advice to the players, point out that no extravagancies were to be used, and leave the rest to the actor to interpret in the tradition of his art, but today we are told that a completely new technique of acting is needed in order to present Shakespeare's plays in the spirit in which they were written. It is true that not all scholars are agreed on these matters, but even temperate opinion would say that the acting of Shakespeare's contemporaries was "fundamentally formal" and only "shaded by naturalism from time to time."[1] "Formal acting" has not been properly defined but it is generally assumed to be the opposite of "natural," and to make no attempt to give an impression of real life. "Poetry and its decent delivery" are considered "the only real essentials of Elizabethan drama."[2]

The study of Elizabethan acting is comparatively new, and although one book has already been published on the subject,[3] the time is hardly ripe for an authoritative and balanced treatise. But in the meantime, what guidance can scholarship give to actors and producers of Shakespeare's plays? It seems to me that the subject has been approached from an unfortunate angle and that, in consequence, the evidence has been distorted and misapplied. Briefly, I believe that formalism on the stage was fast dying out in Shakespeare's age, and that a new naturalism was a kindling spirit in his theatre. This naturalism was not what we understand by the word today, but, in contrast to formalism, it did aim at an illusion of real life. I want to reverse the statement which I have quoted above, and to say that Elizabethan acting aimed at an illusion of life, although some vestiges of an old formalism remained. If this is the case, our modern actors stand a better chance of interpreting Shakespeare than those who were his contemporaries, for the modern tradition is based on a thorough-going naturalism unknown to Elizabethans. If the relics of formalism are properly respected, we can realize the illusion of life with a new delicacy and completeness.

To prove my point, I would have to examine in detail, and in chronological sequence, the whole *corpus* of Elizabethan drama.[4] All I can do here is to counter some of the arguments which might be brought against my statement, and present some evidence which I do not think has been sufficiently discussed.

The earliest advocates of formal acting base their statements on Elizabethan stage conditions; for example, after describing the circled audience and the

J. R. Brown (B.A., B.Litt., Oxon.), is Fellow of the Shakespeare Institute (University of Birmingham), Stratford-upon-Avon and Dean of its annual Post-Graduate Summer School in Elizabethan Drama. His edition of The Merchant of Venice *in the New Arden series will appear shortly.*

[1] S. L. Bethell, "Shakespeare's Actors," *R.E.S.*, new series, I (1950), 205.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] B. L. Joseph, *Elizabethan Acting* (1951).

[4] Previous work on dramatic technique has generally ignored the question of changing or developing methods; e.g., M. C. Bradbrook's pioneering *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy* (1935) explicitly states that "the development of the conventions has been only slightly indicated" because the subject was too large (p. 1).

gallants sitting on the stage, Mr. S. L. Bethell maintains that

> . . . even with the abundance of make-up, scenery, and properties in use to-day, it would have been impossible for actors so closely beset with audience, to create and sustain an illusion of actual life, especially as they performed in broad daylight.[5]

Obviously these conditions made it difficult to sustain an illusion of real life, but nevertheless it was certainly attempted and achieved. Thomas Heywood in his *An Apology for Actors* (1612) writes,

> . . . turne to our domesticke hystories: what English blood, seeing the person of any bold Englishman presented, and doth not hugge his fame, and hunnye at his valor, pursuing him in his enterprise with his best wishes, and as beeing wrapt in contemplation, offers to him in his hart all prosperous performance, *as if the personator were the man personated?*[6]

John Webster, the probable author of the Character of "An Excellent Actor" (1615), uses almost the same words; "what we see him personate, we thinke truely done before us."[7] John Fletcher was praised for giving opportunity for a similar illusion;

> How didst thou sway the Theatre! make us feele
> The Players wounds were true, and their swords, steele!
> Nay, stranger yet, how often did I know
> When the Spectators ran to save the blow?
> Frozen with griefe we could not stir away
> Vntill the Epilogue told us 'twas a Play.[8]

Prolonged death speeches must have made the simulation of real life very difficult—*The Knight of the Burning Pestle* ridicules their excesses—but Burbage evidently could achieve it; not only did the audience think he died indeed, but the dramatic illusion extended to the other actors in the scene with him:

> Oft haue I seene him play this part in ieast,
> Soe liuely, that spectators, and the rest
> Of his sad crew, whilst he but seem'd to bleed,
> Amazed, thought euen then hee dyed in deed.[9]

From such descriptions, we must assume that Elizabethan actors aimed at an illusion of real life and that the best of them achieved it.

Even when it is accepted that the Elizabethan actors aimed at an illusion of real life, it is still possible to write down their acting as "formal." So Professor Harbage maintains that

> we are told *what* the actor did (in the estimation of the spectator), but not *how* he did it. Since the conventions of formal acting will be accepted as just while formal acting prevails, testimony like the above is nugatory.[10]

But this argument only "explains" the evidence if, on other grounds, the acting is known to be "formal." Even if this could be shown, it does not imply that our actors today should attempt formalism; the fact remains that an illusion of life was attempted. If our actors are more thorough in this respect, may they not be interpreting the plays in the spirit in which they were written?

The arguments for formal acting which are based on the plays themselves are difficult to answer directly; a detailed, chronological study is required. But one may point out, in general, that much of the evidence is taken from early plays, the famous Towton scene in *III Henry VI* (II.v) being always to the fore.[11] The formal, didactic arrangement of such scenes died out as the Morality plays, on which they seem

[5] *Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition* (1944), p. 31. See also M. C. Bradbrook, *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy* (1935), pp. 20-21.

[6] Sig. B4; the italics are mine.

[7] John Webster, *Works*, ed. F. L. Lucas (1927), IV, 43.

[8] F. Beaumont and J. Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies* (1647), Sig. f2v.

[9] Quoted from Sir E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (1923), II, 309.

[10] A. Harbage, "Elizabethan Acting," *PMLA*, LIV (1939), 692; the evidence he quotes includes the verses on Burbage quoted above.

[11] For instance, see B. L. Joseph, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-122.

to be based, disappeared also; it is not representative of the first decade of the seventeenth century. Direct address to the audience is another feature of Elizabethan plays which has been adduced in support of formal acting; such speeches have been thought to shatter "all possibility of dramatic illusion."[12] In this case, it is admitted that Shakespeare's plays do not provide any strikingly clear example,[13] yet even if such were found it would not be an unsurmountable obstacle to the simulation of real life on the stage. There was no gap between the audience and the stage in the Elizabethan theatre, and the actors did not address the audience as if it were in another world. There was a reciprocal relationship; the audience could participate in the drama as easily as the actors could share a joke or enlist sympathy. The very fact that it is difficult to distinguish direct address from soliloquy, and soliloquy from true dialogue, shows that the contact with the audience was quite unembarrassed. They shared the illusion of life.

The use of verse in Elizabethan drama has also been taken for a sign that acting was formal; for instance, of the sonnet embedded in the dialogue of *Romeo and Juliet* (I.v.95ff.) it has been said,

> Shakespeare's purpose can only be achieved if his audience is allowed to respond to the figures, the images, and the metrical pattern of these fourteen lines. There is no need to imitate dialogue realistically.[14]

But once more the development of new styles in writing and acting must be taken into account. When Jonson wrote *Timber*, the style of Marlowe already belonged to another age:

> The true Artificer will not runne away from nature, as hee were afraid of her; or depart from life, and the likenesse of Truth; but speake to the capacity of his hearers. And though his language differ from the vulgar somewhat; it shall not fly from all humanity, with the *Tamerlanes*, and *Tamer-Chams* of the late Age.[15]

Once the idea of development is accepted, the question about Elizabethan acting ceases to be "Was it formal or natural?"; it is rather, "Which was the new, dominant style, the fashionable mode in which they would strive to produce even old plays or recalcitrant material?" I believe that the comparison between the style of Jonson's age and that of Marlowe's points in one direction only. It had become possible to speak the verse as if it were meant—as if, at that instant, it sprang from the mind of the speaker. Shakespeare's mature style has the best of two worlds; there is the eloquence, precision, and melody of verse, but there is also the immediacy and movement of actual speech. The dramatist has achieved the ideal which Puttenham sought in the courtly poet; he is now

> a dissembler only in the subtilties of his arte, that is, when he is most artificial, so to disguise and cloake it as it may not appeare, nor seeme to proceede from him by any studie or trade of rules, but to be his naturall.[16]

For such dialogue, a formal, rhetorical delivery would destroy the very quality which the poet had striven to attain. The new dialogue needed a new style of acting, and as the verse became less formal and declamatory, so did the acting. Both aimed at an illusion of life.

[12] S. L. Bethell, *op. cit.*, p. 86.
[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 84-85.
[14] B. L. Joseph, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

[15] *Works*, ed. C. H. Herford and P. and E. Simpson, VIII (1947), 587. Jonson's editors date *Timber* between 1623 and 1635, XI (1952), 213, but Professor C. J. Sisson has shown that the work was probably composed as lecture notes while Jonson was acting as deputy for Henry Croke, the Professor of Rhetoric at Gresham College, in 1619, *TLS* (September 21, 1951).

[16] *The Art of English Poesie* (1589); G. Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (1904), II,186-187.

The internal evidence of the plays has only been hurriedly considered, for its proper treatment would need a greater scope than this present article provides.[17] I would like to turn, therefore, to one piece of external evidence which has been generally accepted as an indication of formal acting. This is the Elizabethan comparison between the actor and the orator. The *locus classicus* is the Character of "An Excellent Actor":

> Whatsoever is commendable in the grave Orator, is most exquisitly perfect in him; for by a full and significant action of body, he charmes our attention.[18]

A later statement is in Richard Flecknoe's *A Short Discourse of the English Stage* (1664) where it is said that Richard Burbage

> had all the parts of an excellent Orator (animating his words with speaking, and Speech with Action).[19]

The comparison between orator and actor is further testified by the use of the word *action* to describe the bodily movements of both artists. From this comparison several deductions might be made; first, the actor used a declamatory voice as distinct from a conversational; secondly, he observed the phrasing, figures, and literary quality of his lines in the manner laid down for the orator; and thirdly, he used "action" to enforce the meaning of his lines rather than to represent the emotion of a character. It has been suggested that John Bulwer's *Chirologia* and *Chironomia,* two books of manual signs for the use of orators, published in 1644, and written by a specialist in the teaching of the deaf, might represent the "actions" used on the Elizabethan stage.[20] But the deductions can go further, and the actor is sometimes endowed with the intentions of the orator; it is thought that he excited the emotions of his audience rather than expressed those of the character he was representing. Under such conditions a play would be a number of speeches, or, at best, a ritual, rather than an image of actual life. It has even been suggested that, in Johnson's words, an Elizabethan went to the theatre in order to

> hear a certain number of lines recited with just gesture and elegant modulation.[21]

Obviously one cannot deny the comparison between actor and orator, but this does not imply that the comparison held at all points; both artists spoke before the people and used gestures—and there the comparison might rest. Distinctions between the two were clearly recognized by Elizabethans. So Abraham Fraunce, speaking of the orator, says that the gesture should change with the voice,

> yet not parasiticallie as stage plaiers vse, but grauelie and decentlie as becommeth men of greater calling.[22]

The distinction may not be flattering to the actor but that there is one is plain enough. Thomas Wright's *The Passions of the Mind* (1604) makes another distinction; the orator is said to

[17] Asides, the arrangement of exits, entries, and other stage movement, the use of type costume and characterization are some of the more obvious details which need chronological analysis.

[18] Cf. A. Harbage, *op cit.*, pp. 701-702; B. L. Joseph, *op. cit., passim;* and S. L. Bethell, "Shakespeare's Actors," *op. cit.*, p. 202.

[19] Quoted from E. K. Chambers, *op. cit.*, IV, 370. There has been some argument about the validity of this evidence; see A. Harbage, *op. cit.*, p. 695 and S. L. Bethell, "Shakespeare's Actors," *op. cit.*, pp. 200-201.

[20] So B. L. Joseph, *op. cit.* Even as an indication of an orator's art the books are suspect, for Bulwer himself confesses that "I never met with any Rhetorician or other, that had picturd out one of these Rhetoricall expressions of the Hands and fingers; or met with any Philologer that could exactly satisfie me in the ancient Rhetoricall postures of *Quintilian.*" (*Chironomia,* p. 26; quoted from Joseph, *ibid.*, pp. 45-47).

[21] B. L. Joseph, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

[22] *The Arcadian Rhetoric* (1588), Sig. 17v

act "really" to "stirre vp all sorts of passions according to the exigencie of the matter," whereas the player acts "fainedly" in the performance of a fiction "onely to delight" (p.179). These distinctions are quoted by Joseph in his book *Elizabethan Acting*,[23] but he does not seem to accept their implications.

Rhetoric was taught in Elizabethan schools and universities and "pronunciation," or delivery, received its due attention. Indeed, Heywood in his *Apology* shows that acting was used as a means of training the young orator (Sig's. C3^{v}-4). If the arts of acting and oratory were truly similar, here was an excellent "school" for actors. But the evidence clearly shows that it was not; the scholars learned a style of acting which was suitable for oratory but condemned on the public stage. So in *II The Return from Parnassus* (*c.*1602), Kemp, the professional actor, criticizes the scholar-players as those who

> neuer speake in their walke, but at the end of the stage, iust as though in walking . . . we should neuer speake but at a stile, a gate, or a ditch, where a man can go no further. (IV.iii)

Kemp criticizes them because they did not act as men do in real life. Richard Brome makes a similar distinction against scholar-players in *The Antipodes* (1640):

> Let me not see you act now,
> In your Scholasticke way, you brought to towne wi' yee,
> . . . Ile none of these, absurdities in my house. (II.ii)

The gestures described in Bulwer's books for orators might well be among the scholastic absurdities which Brome inveighs against. In Campion's *A Book of Airs* (1601) the criticism is more precise:

> But there are some, who to appeare the more deepe, and singular in their iudgement, will admit no Musicke but that which is long, intricate, bated with fuge, chaind with sincopation, and where the nature of euerie word is precisely exprest in the Note, like the old exploided action in Comedies, when if they did pronounce *Memeni*, they would point to the hinder part of their heads, if *Video* put their finger in their eye.[24]

Here, the orator's gestures are considered both scholastic ("deepe and singular") and old-fashioned; clearly Campion thought they were not in use in the up-to-date theatres in London.

Perhaps the distinction between actor and orator is most clearly stated in Flecknoe's praise of Burbage which has already been quoted:

> He had all the parts of an excellent Orator. . . . , yet even then, he was an excellent Actor still, never falling in his Part when he had done speaking; but with his looks and gesture, maintaining it still unto the heighth. . . .

Flecknoe says, in effect, that though Burbage had the graces of an orator, *yet even then* he was an excellent actor—in spite of some likeness of his art to that of oratory.

Earlier in the same passage, Flecknoe had claimed that Burbage

> was a delightful Proteus, so wholly transforming himself into his Part, and putting off himself with his Cloathes, as he never (not so much as in the Tyring-house) assum'd himself again until the Play was done.

Such absorption in one's part has nothing to do with oratory; it is closer to the acting techniques of Stanislavsky. It suggests that an Elizabethan actor sunk himself in his part and did not merely declaim his lines with formal effectiveness. A similar impression is given by the Prologue to *Antonio and Mellida* (first performed in 1599) where actors are shown preparing for their parts and speaking in the appropriate "veins."

[23] Pp. 54 and 58.

[24] To the Reader; *Works*, ed. P. Vivian (1909).

An incidental image in *Coriolanus* implies a similar technique:

> You have put me now to such a part which never
> I shall discharge to the life. (III.ii.105-106.)

In the event, Coriolanus was unable to do as Burbage did and wholly transform himself into his part.

There are many extant descriptions of Elizabethan acting but the value of this evidence is commonly belittled because it is written in the same technical language as the criticism of rhetoric and oratory. So Hamlet's advice to the players is dismissed as "a cliché from classical criticism, equally applicable to all the arts."[25] Or again, it is claimed that the poet has put into the mouth of his Prince nothing that conflicts with the directions normally provided by the teachers of rhetorical delivery.[26]

But the fact that the same language was used for acting and oratory does not mean that the same effect was being described. The language of criticism for all the arts was in its infancy and it was perhaps inevitable that acting should be dependent on the technical vocabulary of a more systematic art.

In attempts to interpret descriptions of acting, words and phrases from the criticism of rhetoric and oratory are frequently noted. But their use in another art may give an entirely different interpretation and may be equally pertinent. The phrase *imitation of life* is an example. It is basic to the conception of poetry as an art of imitation, a conception which was not generally understood by Elizabethans—except for Sidney—as referring to the poet's revelation of ideal and universal truth. The usual interpretation is seen in Sir Thomas Elyot's description of comedy as "a picture or as it were a mirrour of man's life"[27] or in Ascham's idea that drama was a "perfite *imitation*, or faire liuelie painted picture of the life of euerie degree of man."[28] The phrase is constantly repeated; Lodge, Jonson, and Heywood all claimed on Cicero's authority that Comedy was "*imitatio vitae, speculum consuetudinis, et imago veritatis.*"[29]

The idea of drama as a picture of life suggests a parallel in the art of painting, and here the meaning of imitation is much clearer. For instance it is implicit throughout the description of the pictures offered to Christopher Sly in the Induction of *The Taming of the Shrew:*

> —Dost thou love pictures? we will fetch thee straight
> Adonis painted by a running brook,
> And Cytherea all in sedges hid,
> Which seem to move and wanton with her breath,
> Even as the waving sedges play with wind.
> —We'll show thee Io as she was a maid,
> And how she was beguiled and surprised,
> As lively painted as the deed was done.
> —Or Daphne roaming through a thorny wood,
> Scratching her legs that one shall swear she bleeds,
> And at that sight shall sad Apollo weep,
> So workmanly the blood and tears are drawn. (ii.51-62.)

"As lively painted as the deed was done" is the key to the whole of this description, and "life-likeness" or the "imitation of life" were constantly used in the criticism of the visual arts. So Bassanio exclaims when he finds Portia's picture in the leaden casket, "What demi-god Hath come so near creation?" (*The Merchant of Venice* III.ii.116-117), or

[25] A. Harbage, *op. cit.*, p. 690.
[26] B. L. Joseph, *op. cit.*, p. 146.
[27] *The Governor* (1531), ed. H. H. S. Croft (1880), I, 124.
[28] *The Schoolmaster* (1570), *English Works*, ed. W. A. Wright (1904), p. 266.
[29] *A Defence of Poetry* (1579), ed. G. Gregory Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (1904), I, 81; *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1600) III, vi, 206-207; and *An Apology for Actors* (1612), Sig. Flv.

Paulina claims that her "statue" can show life "lively mock'd" (*The Winter's Tale* V.iii.19). For an example outside Shakespeare, we may take Thomas Nashe's description of the floor of an Italian summer house; it was

painted with the beautifullest flouers that euer mans eie admired; which so linealy were delineated that he that viewd them a farre off, and had not directly stood poaringly ouer them, would haue sworne they had liued in deede.[30]

The imitation of life was not the whole concern of renaissance artists, but their experiments in perspective and light were at first designed to deceive the external eye; their paintings were meant to look like real life.

When the phrase is used of acting, of performing in the "picture" that was the drama, it seems to carry the same implications of deception and the appearance of reality. So Webster praises the Queen's Men at the Red Bull for the acting of *The White Devil* in 1612 or 1613:

For the action of the play, twas generally well, and I dare affirme, with the Ioint testimony of some of their owne quality, (for the true imitation of life, without striuing to make nature a monster) the best that euer became them.

So also, the imitation of life is praised in *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, performed in 1611:

thow shalt see my ladie
plaie her part naturallie, more to the life
then shees aware on.[31]

Shakespeare implies the same standards in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona:*

For I did play a lamentable part: . . .
Which I so lively acted with my tears
That my poor mistress, moved therewithal,
Wept bitterly. (IV.iv.171-176.)

The idea of a play as a "lively" picture may be seen in Rowley's verses on *The Duchess of Malfy* (1623):

I Neuer saw thy Dutchesse, till the day,
That She was liuely body'd in thy Play.

Perhaps most important, the "imitation of life" is implicit in Hamlet's advice to the players: he says that the end of playing is

to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure. (III.ii.25-29.)

When he criticizes strutting and bellowing, he invokes the same standard:

I have thought some of nature's journeymen had made men and had not made them well, they imitated humanity so abominably. (II.39-41.)

Hamlet is applying the same criterion to acting that Bassanio did to Portia's picture—how near is it to creation?

The conception of acting as an imitation of life agrees with the other evidence I have quoted, and suggests that Elizabethan actors aimed at an illusion of real life. It does not explain *all* in the best renaissance painting or the best Elizabethan acting, but it has an important place in the artists' intentions. To describe the resultant art as formal is to deny this intention; *natural* seems a more appropriate word.

There is probably some reluctance among scholars to admit that naturalism was a keynote of Elizabethan acting. Some critics would obviously wish the plays to be acted in a formal manner. For instance, it is said that a person in a play may be

first a symbol, second a human being; . . . . [and the play itself can be] primarily an argument or parable, only secondarily forced, as it best may, to assume some correspondence with the forms and events of human affairs.[32]

This is an extreme case, but there are other hints of a fear that naturalism would make Shakespeare's plays "small-

[30] *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594); *Works*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, II (1904), p. 288.

[31] Malone Society Reprint (1909), II, 2015-17.

[32] Written of *Timon of Athens;* G. Wilson Knight, *The Wheel of Fire* (1930), p. 274.

er," that they would lose the meaning and richness that had been found in the study. Formal acting, on the other hand, seems to offer a declamation in which technical accomplishment could be appreciated and the argument or pattern of the drama could stand revealed. But there is more than one kind of naturalism; there is one for plays set in a drawing-room, and another for plays dealing with kings and soldiers, inspired prophets, and accomplished courtiers. A true naturalism would not disguise the high themes of Elizabethan tragedy or the idealism of their comedy.

We have said that Elizabethan dramatists and actors imitated life, but this does not mean that they tried to make their plays exactly the same as real life; they did not labor, in Marston's words, to "relate any thing as an historian but to inlarge every thing as a Poet."[33] Their plays were more exciting and colorful, more full of meaning, than real life; indeed, compared with them, "Nature never set foorth. . . . so rich [a] Tapistry."[34] Yet we may say that they aimed at an imitation of life and the audience was encouraged to take all this as real while the performance was in progress. Within the charmed circle of the theatre, a new world might be accepted as real, and what they saw personated could be accepted as truly done before them.

George Chapman once wrote a preface to a play of his which had never been performed, and in it he tried to analyze what this play had missed. Unlike some critics, he believed that

> scenical representation is so far from giving just cause of any least diminution, that the personal and exact life it gives to any history, or other such delineation of human actions, adds to them lustre, spirit, and apprehension.[35]

A "personal and exact life" was what Chapman expected the actors to give to his play, and these words may serve to describe the naturalism which I believe to be the new power of Elizabethan acting. If actors in today's theatre wish to present Shakespeare's plays in the spirit in which they were written, they should respect and enjoy the magniloquence and music of the language, enter into the greatness of conception, and play all the time for an illusion of real life. They must constantly expect a miracle—that the verse shall be enfranchised as the natural idiom of human beings and that all of Shakespeare's strange creation shall become real and "lively" on the stage. Because the Elizabethan actor was capable of working for this miracle, Shakespeare, like other of his contemporaries, dared to "repose eternitie in the mouth of a Player."[36]

[33] "To the General Reader," *Sophonisba* (1606); *Plays*, ed. H. H. Wood (1938), II, 5.
[34] Philip Sidney, *The Defence of Poesie* (1595); *Works*, ed. A. Feuillerat (1923), III, 8.
[35] Dedication, *Caesar and Pompey* (1631); *Tragedies*, ed. T. M. Parrott (1910), p. 341.
[36] Thomas Nashe, Preface to Robert Greene, *Menaphon* (1589); *Works*, ed R. B. McKerrow (1905), III, 312.

COMMENTARIES

EDWIN BOOTH AS HAMLET

> Mr. Edwin Booth has given Chicago two Hamlets. . . . His first Hamlet was of the cold-feet order: it was the particular admiration of young women who ate slate-pencils, and of men who believed in female suffrage. Having seen this Hamlet several times, we were convinced that, if the original Hamlet were in reality what Mr. Booth represented, he could have been relieved of his malady by judicious prescriptions of vermifuge. Mr. Booth's second Hamlet . . . is . . . a great improvement upon the morbid impersonation of twenty years ago.—Eugene Field, "Chicago Hamlets," *Culture's Garland* . . . (Boston, 1887), pp. 33-34.

A NEW GOETHE DISCOVERY: THE WEILBURGER GOETHE-FUNDE

Eugene Bahn

IN the spring of 1949, Hans-Georg Boehme, of the Paedagogisches Institut, Weilburg an der Lahn, Hesse, Germany, received information that Frau Hertha Bergius, a lady living in the vicinity, wished to sell a letter of the famous Goethe. Dr. Boehme promptly called on Frau Bergius and learned that she was a direct descendant of the famous actor, Pius Alexander Wolff. According to Frau Bergius, the letter from Goethe had been preserved by the heirs of Wolff for more than a century. The actor had been personally trained by the great Goethe according to the principles of the poet-playwright, and in 1832, shortly before his death, Goethe wrote, "Much as I have developed and much as has been stimulated by me, I can name but one man who has developed wholly according to my ideas, and that was the actor Wolff." Therefore, it was highly probable that any letters or papers Frau Bergius might have pertaining to Goethe or Wolff would be of literary and historical significance, and Dr. Boehme urged her to make a systematic search for everything bearing upon the instruction of the famous actor. Before long Frau Bergius brought to Dr. Boehme a bundle of old letters, notes, and other documents which she had found in her attic.

Dr. Boehme,[1] an able scholar of literature and history, began systematically to study the valuable manuscripts. The result of his meticulous research is a most interesting book, *Die Weilburger Goethe-Funde*, published by *Die Schaubuehne*, Volume 36, 1950, Verlag Lechte, Emsdetten.

The *Weilburger Goethe-Funde* includes the following items, of which most are discoveries entirely new to the world of drama and letters:

1. The class notes taken down by Pius Alexander Wolff while he was a student of Goethe.

2. The "Regeln fuer Schauspieler," which is an extension of the above class notes.

3. The "Regeln fuer Schauspieler," a hitherto unprinted statement by Wolff on the actor's art.

4. Points upon which the members of the Weimar Dramatic Academy are agreed.

5. Two lectures on the Art of the Theatre by Wolff.

6. Five letters of Goethe written to the Wolffs.

7. A fragment of *Torquato Tasso* found in the ruins of the burned Weimar Hoftheater.

8. Four letters written by Frau Wolff to her husband.

9. Fragments of the diary of Amalie and Marianne Wolff, 1829.

10. A quatrain on art, which Goethe wrote in a "Stammbuch."

The *Weilburger Goethe-Funde* clearly includes a number of items of interest to the student of the theatre; and it also contains a number of items of interest to

Eugene Bahn is Associate Professor of Speech at Wayne University. After spending six and a half years in Germany as Educational and Cultural Officer with the U. S. State Department and Military Government, he returned to the United States in August, 1952.

[1] The writer regrets having to report that Dr. Boehme died during the past summer.

the student of interpretative reading. The embryonic actor Pius Alexander Wolff was a conscientious student who recorded many of the words of his master, the great Goethe. He was fairly systematic, as his notebook reveals; its table of contents is as follows:

Goethe

1. Ueber Dialect.
2. Aussprache, reine, vollstaendige.
3. Recitation und Declamation.
4. Rhythmischer Vortrag.
5. Stellung und Bewegung des Koerpers auf der Buehne.
6. Stellung und Bewegung ausser der Buehne.

Like most European students, Wolff was aware that his teacher was an authority and he attached great value to Goethe's ideas concerning dramatic art. The first item to be treated in the notes was "Dialect." Goethe has stressed to his young student that "the first and most important thing for the actor is to rid himself of all errors of dialect and to try to achieve completely pure speech."[2] Clear speech, without provincial elements, then, was the first prerequisite for the beginning actor. Next Goethe advised the young actor to speak slowly and enunciate his syllables clearly; furthermore, he advises young Pius Alexander, as a beginner, to use as deep a tone as possible and gradually raise the pitch to develop greater range and modulation. The deep tone should be sustained as long as possible.

The third section of the class notes, "Recitation und Declamation," is of special interest to the actor and the reader. In recitation, Pius quotes his master as saying that the reader should bring out the sensitivity and feeling of the author, without the exaggeration used in declamation, for in recitation the speaker follows the idea of the poet with his tone, whether it be gentle, tender, pleasant, or unpleasant. In recitation the leader does not alter his own native character nor try to alter his own nature.[3] In declamation, however, Goethe points out a difference, for here, in "der gesteigerten Recitation"[4] the reader's own character must be lost, his native characteristics altered. He himself must be lost in the character, in which he can use all the subtleties and range of tone he possesses.

On the fourth topic, "Rhytmischer Vortrag," Pius Alexander seems to have found less to write. He knew that the tone must serve the meaning. He wrote, somewhat obscurely, that the first word of every iamb should have more emphasis than the words following, and that the final word in every iamb should be slightly set apart.

Bearing or deportment might be expected to command considerable attention in this period of theatre history. Thus no one should be surprised to find a section of Pius Alexander's notes headed "The Position and Movement of the Body on the Stage." The basic principles of movement, says Goethe, must become second nature to the actor. He must hold his body erect; his upper arm must stay near his body; and the spectator must see three quarters of his face. Before each speech he must take a step back and at the end of the speech he must take a step forward—this, he reports, is a major rule of tragedy.

Young Pius records, from his master, that the actor must know the exact proportions of the stage, for nothing on the stage can be accidental; the actor must know exactly what movements he will make—where he moves, stands, kneels, or sits when he is given a "Monolog," or long speech. The actor is advised to consider the proscenium arch a frame beyond which he should not step.

[2] P. 11.

[3] P. 13.

[4] P. 14.

Goethe is not concerned solely with the action of his actors on stage; he tells them that they must be just as aware of their actions off the stage; they must feel that their public is always watching them. An amusing note is Goethe's advice to his young actor that the two middle fingers, on or off stage, must always stay together, and the thumb, index, and little fingers should be somewhat bent or curved.

A second set of rules for the actor was also found among the papers of Pius Alexander Wolff. Dr. Boehme's opinion is that Wolff enlarged upon his earlier notes from memory. He repeats many of the points just noted, adds others, and concludes with the advice that everything an actor does has an effect upon his art.

In two studies on the art of acting Wolff expressly states his indebtedness to Goethe and keeps notes of all his work with the great man. The first of these is entitled "Bemerkungen ueber die Stimme und ihre Ausbildung zum Vortrag auf der Buehne." In the second, "Ueber den Vortrag im Trauerspiel," he again compares recitation and declamation:

> Recitation is simple delivery, but with all shadows and lights, forte and piano. Feeling and enthusiasm must rule in recitation, but the reciter does not lose his character, and can be compared to a piano, which without the help of mutations which the instrument has, a piece of music is produced with feeling and completeness.[5]

In the same study, Wolff says that Goethe met with the beginning actors several times weekly to give them exercises in rhythmic delivery. He believed in the value of studying the speeches of ancient heroes and gods for developing weight and earnestness. Wolff describes the vocal work of the actors under Goethe's direction in the Weimar Hoftheater, as having the effect of an orchestra, and adds that Goethe rehearsed a play as an opera was prepared, with careful attention to *tempo, forte, piano, crescendo,* and *diminuendo.* In the early stages of a production, rehearsals were held for small groups of actors, often before the ensemble began to rehearse.

The five letters of Goethe to Frau and Herr Wolff included in this volume are dated 1809, 1810, 1811, and two in 1812. These letters show the friendly spirit in which Goethe held the Wolffs, his praise of their theatrical talent, and his suggestions for the delivery of certain speeches.

The discovery of this new material adds to our knowledge of one of the world's greatest poets and thinkers and increases our acquaintance with a leading German actor, and protégé of Goethe, Pius Alexander Wolff.

[5] P. 78.

COMMENTARIES

GOETHE AS PRODUCER AND DIRECTOR

> Goethe's fame as poet has overshadowed his fame as régisseur and stage director. Yet Goethe the régisseur and stage director contributed as much to German theatrical art as Goethe the poet to German literature. There was, properly speaking, nothing that could be called a German theatre up to the time of Goethe. . . .
>
> The Court theatre at Weimar, under Goethe's direction, became the training school for a tradition of German acting, establishing a definite national impress which had far-reaching effects. . . . It was Goethe who defined the ideals and principles that have had the most profound influence on the German theatre down to the present day.—Arthur Woehl, "Goethe's Rules for Actors: A Translation with an Introduction," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education,* XII, 3 (June 1927), 243-244.

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH TO THE DEAF

Powrie Vaux Doctor

EVER since the establishment of the first school for the deaf in the United States, by Thomas Braidwood at Cobbs, Virginia, in 1815, and the establishment of the first permanent public school for the deaf by Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet at Hartford, Connecticut, in 1817, speech has been taught to the deaf in the United States. From the year 1850 to the present time the teaching of speech in schools and classes for the deaf in the United States and Canada has been a basic part of the curriculum. In the average residential school for the deaf today the teaching of speech is fully as important as the teaching of other subjects.

Since the close of World War II the teaching of speech to the deaf and to the hard of hearing in the United States has broadened its scope. No doubt the plight of the war-deafened soldier is somewhat responsible for a new interest in the matter. However, this new interest has coincided with an improvement in hearing aids for people with impaired hearing. These two factors—the military rehabilitation program for the deafened soldiers and the great improvement in the use of hearing aids—created greater interest not only of the hard of hearing but also of the deaf. At the same time a much greater growth appeared in the interest of parents in finding out how they could be of help to their hearing handicapped children. This interest on the part of parents was greatly responsible for the development of preschool groups for deafened children throughout the country. However, interest was not confined to preschool groups, as demonstrated by the tremendous growth in speech and hearing clinics in colleges, universities, medical schools, and in hospitals.

According to the *American Annals of the Deaf* for January, 1953, 21,515 pupils were enrolled in schools and classes for the deaf in the United States for the year 1952-53. Of this number 13,996 were in residential schools for the deaf, 1,878 in day schools for the deaf, 3,771 in day classes for the deaf, and 1,900 in private and denominational classes and schools for the deaf. Of this number, 19,003 were reported as being taught speech.

According to the January, 1953, *Annals*, 147 Speech and Hearing Clinics were reported as operating in colleges and universities in the United States. The figure for the January, 1954, *Annals* will far exceed this number, for many new clinics have been organized during the past year. Virtually all the clinics offer speech training. The training for those with impaired hearing may be speech correction for the hard of hearing or the teaching of speech to deaf pupils. Some clinics also offer courses in the teaching of speech to the deaf for the parents of preschool age deaf children. A number of these clinics also offer training to teachers of the deaf.

Departments of Education in thirteen states reported that they supervised speech and hearing clinics for the year 1952-53. Some of the departments do this work in connection with the state

Mr. Doctor (Ph.D., Georgetown University, 1940), Editor of American Annals of the Deaf, *is now Chairman of the Department of History and Political Science at Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C.*

residential schools for the deaf, some with the Division for Crippled Children, and some with children's clinics in hospitals.

The State Departments of Health are expanding their services greatly in connection with speech and hearing. In general, however, the speech work in such clinics seems to be subordinate to the work done with hearing.

Twenty-four states, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii are represented in the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc., as doing speech work with people having hearing defects.

All these statistics give a fairly good over-all view of the work being done in speech therapy in the United States today. However, in spite of all the increase in medical and clinical services for speech work with the deaf the January, 1953, *Annals* also reported 1,185 children in the United States and Canada as being on the waiting list to gain admission into schools and classes for the deaf, 119 of this group in Canada. Of this number 664 were under the age of six, 340 between the ages of six and ten, and 181 ten or above.

One of the main reasons for such a waiting list is the lack of trained teachers of the deaf. In 1952-53, the twenty-two training centers in the United States reported 108 teachers finishing their training in June, 1953. This number does not refill vacancies caused by resignation, death, or other reasons. The number of new teachers needed in schools and classes for the deaf in the United States is large and becomes larger each year.

One of the reasons for a shortage of trained teachers of the deaf is the great amount of training necessary. Teaching speech to a child born deaf is without doubt the most difficult job in the educational world. The person who becomes deaf at the age of sixteen has speech and language patterns. He will probably need corrective speech because he cannot hear his own voice and correct his own pronunciation. A child becoming deaf at the age of six years has heard speech and has speech; the task of teaching him will be infinitely more difficult than teaching the person deafened at the age of sixteen. But the supreme task is to teach a child who has been born deaf and has never heard sound. Virtually his only conception of sound is through the visual and tactile approach. Also, at present almost all primary schools for the deaf in the United States make extensive use of hearing aid equipment. However, in spite of all the medical and mechanical advances made in the field of hearing, the supply of trained teachers is not increasing sufficiently to meet the needs.

The hearing aid is without doubt one of the great achievements in the field of hearing in this century. However, the fact that many hard of hearing people do benefit from hearing aids has led to the mistaken belief that hearing aids can benefit all deaf people. Of the 21,545 pupils reported as being in schools and classes for the deaf during the year 1952-53, 6,883 were reported as using a group hearing aid and 4,552 as using an individual hearing aid.

Some people have difficulty understanding why speech cannot be taught to all deaf people and wonder why fingerspelling and the language of signs persist. Virtually all large state residential schools for the deaf in the United States and in Canada use what is known as the Combined System in teaching the deaf. This system provides for speech classes for deaf pupils who can benefit from the teaching of speech and speechreading. Likewise, provision is made for pupils who cannot benefit

from the teaching of speech. In such classes non-oral methods are used.

Teachers of speech and speech correction in colleges and universities might benefit greatly if they were aware of the wealth of material on the teaching of speech to be found in libraries and journals of the deaf. Alexander Graham Bell became interested in teaching the deaf because of his background as a teacher of speech. The Volta Library, which he founded in Washington, D.C., has the largest collection of books on the deaf in the world. Although hundreds of volumes in this library are on teaching speech to the deaf, much of the material can be utilized and adapted to the teaching of speech for hearing people. Most of the books published in Europe on the teaching of speech are to be found in this library.

The *American Annals of the Deaf*, founded in 1847 at the American School for the Deaf in Hartford, Connecticut, has much material on the teaching of speech to the deaf in the United States, from 1847 to the present time. This journal, the oldest in existence on the teaching of the deaf, is indexed from 1847 to 1945.

The *Proceedings* of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, founded in 1850 in New York City, which contains many articles on speech, speechreading, and speech correction, provides excellent primary source material. A thesis written at Gallaudet College in 1949 by Mr. and Mrs. Warren Fauth affords an excellent review of all the papers published in the *Proceedings* from 1850 to 1949 on speech and speechreading. The *Annual School Reports* published by most of the schools for the deaf from 1817 to 1900 provide much material on the teaching of speech to the deaf. Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C., has an excellent working library for teachers doing work in speech for the deaf.

Some authorities believe that with the increase in medical care and mechanical aids the rate of deafness will decrease. At present the rate of enrollment in schools for the deaf in the United States shows an increase, largely attributable, no doubt, to the increase in population and especially in school population. However, blindness is on the increase, especially in the case of premature births. Pierce W. Theobald of the Northwestern University Medical School believes that an increasing awareness of deafness on the part of physicians may be responsible for some of the reported increase in deafness, but he also says:

> It would seem that the real increase is largely due to the increased and often indiscriminate use of antibiotics for the treatment of upper respiratory (nose and throat) infections, particularly in children.

In addition the hazards of occupational deafness make the prospects for a diminishing number of deaf people somewhat gloomy.

From 1900 to 1950 the great changes in the education of the deaf have been in the increased use of hearing aids, the use of standardized tests in schools for the deaf, and the awareness of parents that wise assistance can help a hearing handicapped child. If present trends continue the next fifty years should see extremely close cooperation between medical schools, hospitals, and schools and classes for the deaf, besides a much greater increase in the scope of work of speech and hearing clinics, especially in colleges and universities. All these trends, however, require far more professionally trained personnel than has been available in the past, and such centers and clinics may well be forced to curtail their services because of the lack of competent staff. This problem has confronted schools for the deaf since 1817.

ARISTOTLE AND THE MODERN RHAPSODE

Robert Marsh

I

SINCE principles of oral interpretation derive in large part from conceptions of the nature of the material to be interpreted,[1] when all poetry is treated as "meaningful discourse" or "communication" between author and audience, the principles of oral interpretation of poetry are usually fundamentally those of rhetoric and dialectic. Communication of the author's meaning is the purpose, and the problems, devices, and criteria of success in oral reading are determined by that purpose. Even in the work of Cunningham,[2] where poetry is conceived as a fine art to be known and reproduced, the special descriptions and qualifications of poems are affective and rhetorical: the relevant formal elements of poetry are discussed primarily in terms of a list of universal emotional and sensory responses that the literary artist supposedly strives to evoke, and in such a scheme differentiation between rhetorical and poetic literature is impossible. Moreover, Cunningham's fine-art priniciples of balance, proportion, unity, harmony, variety, contrast are operable in almost any medium and actually are not even limited to aesthetic questions.[3]

When poetry, in some of its forms, may be considered essentially different

Mr. Marsh (A.B. San Diego State College, 1950; M.S. University of Oregon, 1951) is instructor in English and Speech at New York State College for Teachers in Albany. He is now completing his work in absentia *toward the doctorate in the Aesthetics of Literature program at The Johns Hopkins University.*

[1] Even when theories of interpretation are developed apparently apart from any special theory of literature they can be traced back to initial literary assumptions. Generally speaking, moreover, literary theories reflect fundamental philosophical conceptions that govern the more particular statements about literary works. Although relevant comments are necessary now and then, this discussion is not concerned primarily with metaphysics *per se*. The central questions will turn around two different literary principles as they relate to the art of oral interpretation. Both are discoverable in Aristotle, distinguished from each other, and may be designated as the imitation (poetic) and the communication (rhetorical) theories.

[2] *Literature as a Fine Art* (New York: Ronald Press, 1941).

[3] Cunningham's theory, however, regardless of some shortcomings, is far more nearly satisfactory than the recent attempt to reduce the oral reading of poetry to a kind of think-the-thought adjustment to a complex of attitudes that is supposed to be the poem: see Don Geiger, "Oral Interpretation and the 'New Criticism,'" *QJS*, XXXVI (December 1950), 508-513. Cf. A 'Dramatic' Approach to Interpretative Analysis," *QJS*, XXXVIII (April 1952), 189-194, which is an attempt to use certain principles ripped from the context of Kenneth Burke's *A Grammar of Motives* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1945). The result is so watered-down and distorted that Mr. Burke would refuse connection with any part of it. Burke is a rhetorician, but he knows it. See his "Kinds of Criticism," *Poetry*, LXVIII (August 1946), 272 ff., and cf. "A 'Dramatistic' View of 'Imitation,'" *Accent*, XII (Autumn 1952), 229: ". . . any poem can be studied either as a piece of rhetorical exhortation or as a means of purveying information (news, knowledge, science). But *essentially, culminatively*, it is only scientific works that should be approached *directly* in terms of truth, knowledge, perception, and the like." In a recent lecture sponsored by the Department of Writing, Speech, and Drama at The Johns Hopkins University, Burke clearly pointed out that his main interest has always been "extrinsic" (see "Kinds of Criticism," *loc cit.*), but that somewhere along the line we must get at the poem as a poem—not as sociology, rhetoric, or "complexes of attitudes"—and this he hopes to do in his forthcoming *Symbolic of Motives*. Whether he succeeds will largely depend, perhaps, on his ability to lose the heavy rhetorical-sociological emphasis that has been his for so many years. If the article "A 'Dramatistic' View of 'Imitation'" (*loc. cit.*) is any indication, there is some doubt that he will succeed. (Cf. "The Problem of the Intrinsic," *A Grammar of Motives*, pp. 469-475.)

from meaningful discourse or communication, the principles of oral interpretation which derive from a supposed identity between poetry and rhetoric or dialectic are obviously inappropriate. The purpose is to re-create the literary object, the poem; and re-creating the poem is not equivalent to communicating the total meaning, unless to begin with total meaning is construed as essentially different from discourse, whereupon there is no need for the term *meaning* at all.

Our primary concern here will be with the oral interpretation of a form of poetry, usually called the lyric, that can be conceived as a mode of imitation, in the dramatic manner, with a human action as its object. When a particular poem is so conceived, the appropriate oral interpretation differs from one based on the assumption that all poems are direct speaker-to-audience meaningful discourse. A simple experiment consisting of two alternate readings of a typical lyric, one a declamation or speech, the other a dramatic portrayal, may serve to make this clear;[4] or, by analogy, consider Hamlet on the one hand directly telling an audience, and on the other passionately reflecting, that the question is "to be or not to be."

II

Conceived as the re-creating of an imitation of an action, the oral interpretation of such a lyric poem is essentially the same problem as acting. An actor does not speak his lines directly to the spectators but must appear to be speaking directly to other actors on the stage, to himself, or to the elements—at any rate not directly to his spectators. Many complications are involved in such a statement, for the history of acting reveals many attitudes toward the actor's relation to his audience. The reference here is to the actor as interpreter of a role in a drama; other conceptions of the actor are largely irrelevant.

Originally separate actors did not exist; poets acted their own poems, or sometimes the poems of other poets, as Ion interpreted Homer.[5] The transition from the dithyramb singer to the tragic drama of Greece[6] was natural so long as the poets could be their own actors, at least to start with. The addition of

[4] In the absence of physical demonstrations, the validity of this statement may be tested tentatively by a consideration of the probable difference between two oral readings of Wordsworth's "The Solitary Reaper": *first* as, for example, Wordsworth's own statement or expression of conviction that in the phenomenon of that melancholy singing maiden lies the natural secret of real art and universal truth, that beauty and truth are found in the simple rustic laboring peasant; *second* as the poet's portrayal of an act of troubled searching on the part of a human being who is deeply sensitive to natural, melancholy, and humble things, but who is not exceedingly analytical or patient, for the "meaning" of a song—its theme—as explanation of his deep feelings—a character's passionate quest for an answer to the question "Will no one tell me what she sings?" The use of the term *imitation* is made precise by its application in specific contexts. In this paper, the English words *portrayal* and *representation* may be generally helpful as rough equivalents. Actually, the emphasis is on the "efficient cause" of mimesis, but the term is for practical reasons applied to both the *activity* of mimesis and the *result* of that activity, the accomplished portrayal. The term *lyric* signifies in this paper that genus comprising imitations of action in the dramatic manner in which there is only one speaker or agent doing whatever is done. It is not meant to signify a species in the strictest sense: as when the tragedy may be called a species of play.

[5] Aristotle, *Rhetoric* iii. 1.1403b23; *Poetics* 4.1448b24-1449a30. Most references to Aristotle herein will be to the translations reprinted in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941). In the present context Aristotle's defense of mimetic poetry against the onslaughts of Plato can also be taken as a defense of the art of the rhapsode. Nevertheless, poetry, to Aristotle, is primary and the rhapsode secondary—if a choice of one or the other must be made in the first place.

[6] *Ibid.* This is a touchy subject. See William Ridgeway, *The Origin of Tragedy* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1910), pp. 4-10, 24, 38, 54-57 and *passim*, for an entirely different account. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, in his *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy* (Lon-

bona fide actors occurred after the more complex dramatic form had begun to develop as literature in its own right;[7] the single poet certainly could not dramatically portray two or more people on the stage at the same time—as the rhapsode, with the narrative epic form, could easily portray different people at the "same" time and different actions at different places at the "same" time and place.[8] Therefore acting came into being as a special art subordinated to the larger, but respectively different, arts of poetry and play production.

When the poet could separate himself as poet from the activities of production, the creative writer as we know him emerged. The process was not quite as simple as it sounds; nevertheless, where originally there was one now three distinct arts can be discerned: the arts of the maker, the actor, and the producer-director. The poet, moreover, became even more independent of the actual production when someone discovered that pleasure could be derived from the silent reading of poetry.[9]

The rhapsode, who used to sing the lyrics and recite the narratives, could then be absorbed easily by the dramatic productions; or, skilled as he was in the arts of speech and pantomime, he might eventually become a declaimer and assimilate himself into the art of oratory.[10] Later, when he was able to emerge again in his own right as an oral interpreter, he bore the inevitable marks either of rhetoric and declamation or of histrionics and character portrayal —or of a certain combination of the two.

When the oral interpreter wishes to perform his own art in its own terms, however, independent of acting *per se* and oratorical declamation, he is likely to choose forms of literature in which the actor and the declaimer are not particularly interested. Among these forms are the shorter poems. Appropriate especially is the lyric, for the lyric is in a sense a chip off the old block of drama, because it is imitated action, not rhetoric. Moreover, its magnitude is especially suitable to the modern rhapsode's specialized activity, since it usually can be presented whole.

The lyric is a dramatic form of imitated action. Even when the action portrayed is a speaker's declaiming or persuading, the lyric is not the declamation or the persuasive speech but an imitation of a character in the act of declaiming or persuading. The masterpieces of

don: Oxford University Press, 1927), separates dithyramb and tragedy as distinct in origin and development: ". . . the attempts to explain tragedy by deriving it from dramatic representations at the tombs of deceased heroes, or by the forms of a supposed passion-play, however conceived, appear to run contrary to evidence. Equally improbable is the belief that tragedy, even in its early stages, was ever acted by a chorus of satyrs; the evidence on the whole tends to show that dithyramb in the strict sense, satyric drama, and tragedy were always distinct, and followed each its own line of development" (p. 220). This statement is in basic accord with Aristotle's account, as we realize if we note (1) that when tragedy came into being dithyramb did not necessarily have to pass away and (2) that Aristotle says (*op. cit.* 1449a10-11) that tragedy began with the *authors* of dithyrambs, not the dithyrambs themselves. In any case this difficulty does not greatly affect the present discussion. Cf. also John W. Donaldson, *The Theatre of the Greeks*, 8th ed. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1879), pp. 1-48 and 54-73; J. E. Harrison, *Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1912), pp. 260-363; A. Lang, *Myth, Ritual and Religion* (London: Longmans, Green, 1899), II, 248-255.

[7] Aristotle, *op. cit.* 4.1448b24-1449a30; 5.1449a37-b8; 9.1451b33-38.

[8] *Ibid.* 3.1448a19-b3; 5.1449b9-19; 24.1459b17-30.

[9] *Ibid.* 6.1450b18-20; 14.1453b1-12; 26.1462a11-13, 17.

[10] Thus some Hellenic orators were said to use the style of the poets (cf. *Rhetoric* iii. 1.1413b20-26), such behavior being more like that of the rhapsode than of the public speaker, and a period of *declamatio* occurred in Roman times in which the actual practical application of public speaking could be ignored and speeches given merely for show or entertainment. Cf. Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism* (New York: Ronald Press, 1948), pp. 98-100 ff.

oratory in *Julius Caesar* are not examples of oratory *per se* but of poetic imitation in which the oratory is part of an action. The actor portraying Antony is not concerned with the oratory or the rhetoric *per se* but with its function in portraying the character in the total action which is the play. Similarly, the oral reader of a lyric poem that might resemble an oration will not be concerned with the rhetoric or the communication except as these might be determined by and contribute to his re-creation of a character in action. Thus the oral reading of a typical lyric poem is essentially identical with the art of acting. The main differences are circumstantial or quantitative.

III

So far this paper has set down rough outlines of certain basic principles derived from an Aristotelian attitude toward literature and oral interpretation; it remains to bring together the general outlines of what an Aristotelian might suggest as foundation for carrying out the task of re-creating an imitated action. Since the primary concern of this paper is with problems peculiar to oral interpretation, the various elements of Aristotle's poetic theory pertaining to poems themselves need not be considered here. The oral interpreter must obtain his knowledge of poems through poetic theory, not through interpretative theory, and poetic theory is a common concern of poets, critics, and scholars in general from whom the interpreter borrows his knowledge of poems. In Aristotle's poetic theory the whole poem, composed of object, manner, and means of imitation, is responsible for the proper emotional effect; his considerations of diction, plot, and character, for example, are focused on the composition of a whole object that can produce a distinctive effect, not on any isolated effects of character or language. Consequently, in an Aristotelian theory of interpretation the emphasis must be placed on re-creating the whole poem, of which the action is the principal part to which all else is directed, not on producing various isolated effects.

Authorities seem to agree that Aristotle, as a philosopher interested in facts and demonstrations, considered delivery to be something like a necessary evil. In neither rhetoric nor poetry were the truly important problems those of delivery or acting. But the task of this paper is to organize the essential principles of a theory of oral interpretation, not to settle the old controversy over the importance of delivery. First of all, Aristotle obviously would not conceive the art of oral interpretation as merely one of delivery; but neither would he consider it a proper part of the art of poetry. For Aristotle, the arts of production (acting, musicianship, scene design, costuming, dancing) are separate from the art of poetry.[11] Although in rhetoric delivery is distinguished, as a part of the "how," from the more fundamental art of discovering the available factual, ethical, emotional, and logical means of persuasion,[12] it is conceived for practical reasons as a proper part of that art, but acting is not conceived as a proper part of, or even necessary to, the art of poetry. In Aristotle's conception, moreover, rhetoric is basically a natural *practical* art;[13] poetry is an artificial *productive* art.[14] For Aristotle, therefore, poetry

[11] *Poetics* 6.1450b18-20.
[12] *Rhetoric* iii. 1.1403b1-12.
[13] Cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* i. 2 and vi. 5.
[14] *Nic. Eth.* vi. 4; *Metaphysics* vii. 7-8. This does not mean that an oration cannot be treated as a product but that the original essential function of its subject matter is to communicate with or persuade listeners, not to be beautiful (cf. *Poetics* 7.1450b21-1451a).

employs the arts of delivery only incidentally. The actor must also possess knowledge of poems analogous to the public speaker's knowledge of what to say on a given occasion. The art of acting, or oral interpretation, must partake of principles of both poetry and delivery. In other words, the art of rhetoric includes both the *what* and the *how*, but the interpretative art borrows the *what* from the distinct art of poetry.

A passage in the *Poetics*,[15] although on a specifically different topic, gives the key to Aristotle's attitude toward the problems of this art of interpretation and character portrayal:

> . . . the poet should remember (1) to put the actual scenes as far as possible before his eyes. In this way, seeing everything with the vividness of an eye-witness as it were, he will devise what is appropriate, and be least likely to overlook incongruities. . . . (2) As far as may be, too, the poet should even act his story with the very gestures of his personages. Given the same natural qualifications, he who feels the emotions to be described will be the most convincing; distress and anger, for instance, are portrayed most truthfully by one who is feeling them at the moment. Hence it is that poetry demands a man with a special gift for it, or else one with a touch of madness in him; the former can easily assume the required mood, and the latter may be actually beside himself with emotion.

This passage is followed by a suggestion that the poet would do well to start with a simple outline of his story. This latter suggestion, however, is applicable to the construction of anything in language; the peculiar suggestions are those of (1) having the imagined action as vividly before one's eyes as possible, and (2) feeling the emotions by going through the actions of the characters.

If we realize that Aristotle is discussing an art of imitation, of making artificial likenesses[16] of things (μίμησις), the relevance of this passsage is clear. As sharing the common mimetic problem of convincing portrayal, both oral interpretation and making poems will gain, according to Aristotle, from what we today might call (1) visualization and (2) empathic response.

Another passage,[17] however, points to specific differences between the two arts:

> As regards Diction, one subject for inquiry under this head is the turns to the language when spoken; e.g., the difference between command and prayer, simple statement and threat, question and answer, and so forth. The theory of such matters, however, belongs to Elocution and the professors of that art. Whether the poet knows these things or not, his art as a poet is never seriously criticized on that account. What fault can one see in Homer's 'Sing of the wrath, Goddess'?—which Protagoras has criticized as being a command where a prayer was meant, since to bid one do or not do, he tells us, is a command. Let us pass over this, then as appertaining to another art, and not to that of poetry.

In other words, the poet's business is to make the poems, the interpreter's to know how to read them. And Protagoras' notion that a given line is a command by the nature of its isolated meaning is naïve, since the whole action determines the meaning of any given part of it. But whether the line is to be read aloud as a command or an entreaty is a matter not for the poet to decide, although he would probably know, but for the interpreter. Aristotle does not say, however, that the poet need not be able to portray actions convincingly.

[15] 17.1455a24-35. Cf. John Dolman, Jr., *The Art of Acting* (New York: Harper, 1949), pp. 40-62 ff.

[16] *Poetics* 25.1460b8-9. (See note 4, above.)

[17] *Ibid.* 19.1456b9-19; cf. 26.1462a11-13. The terms *specifically* and *generically* should produce no special difficulty if it is remembered, for example, that imitative or mimetic arts are only one kind of art. We begin with communicative as different from imitative arts; thus, also, these two arts are generically similar in being arts but specifically different in having for example different purposes. Cf. *Metaph.* v. 9.1018a12-14. The proper orientation depends, in a sense, on the level and point of likeness at which one begins—what is designated as genus—for a particular task *at hand*.

That the arts of acting and rhetorical delivery are generically similar gains support from a passage in the *Rhetoric*:[18]

> A third [question of effectiveness] would be the proper method of delivery: this is a thing that affects the success of a speech greatly; but hitherto the subject has been neglected. Indeed, it was long before it found a way into the arts of tragic drama and epic recitation: at first poets acted their tragedies themselves. It is plain that delivery has just as much to do with oratory as with poetry [i.e., dramatic production of poems]. (In connexion with poetry, it has been studied by Glaucon of Teos among others.) It is, essentially, a matter of the right management of the voice to express the various emotions—of speaking loudly, softly, or between the two; of high, low, or intermediate pitch; of the various rhythms that suit various subjects. These are the three things—volume of sound, modulation of pitch, and rhythm—that a speaker bears in mind. . . .
>
> When the principles of delivery have been worked out, they will produce the same effect [i.e., have the same success] as on the stage. But only very slight attempts to deal with them have been made and by a few people, as by Thrasymachus in his 'Appeals to Pity.' Dramatic ability is a natural gift, and can hardly be systematically taught. The principles of good diction can be so taught, and therefore we have men of ability in this direction too who win prizes in their turn, as well as those speakers who excell in delivery—speeches of the written or literary kind owe more of their effect to their diction than to their thought.

These passages indicate that Aristotle conceived the essential requisite of delivery, in both rhetoric and poetry, to be dramatic or mimetic ability, and that this was for him the talent necessary for what we now call oral interpretation. Since probably the sort of principles Thrasymachus worked out can be systematically taught, the "dramatic ability" mentioned here is apparently that same gift required of mimetic poets. In oratory as well as dramatic portrayal, then, Aristotle would suggest that the speaker must (1) visualize and (2) empathize in order to give a convincing performance. Even when a speech is impromptu, and hence more or less spontaneous, this principle would operate, for the subject matter and the mode of expression are logically if not numerically separable; indeed, the impromptu speaker operates directly and immediately in terms of the topic at hand, but the extemporaneous or set speaker must visualize and empathize into material he has prepared beforehand. The public speaker's subject matter is natural, however, concerned with communication and persuasion in practical affairs—law and crime, politics and economics, celebration and calumny. As such it is not itself imitation; imitation operates directly only in the process of delivery. The oral interpreter of lyric poems, on the other hand, deals with pieces of literature that are themselves dramatic imitations; the poet has, through his own mimetic activity, produced the poem, and the oral interpreter must visualize and empathize into it. Even when the poem is an imitation of a philosophical or forensic action, it is the imitation that the oral interpreter must re-create.

Hence if oral interpretation is conceived to be essentially mimetic and the lyric poem to be an imitation of an action—both in materials that the natural action would not be disposed to take[19]—then the oral reading of a lyric

[18] iii. 1.1403b20-1404a19. Delivery also receives the general qualification that it should not be executed for its own sake and should be neither over nor underdone, and the familiar golden mean applies as well to dance and gestures in acting (cf. *Poetics* 26.1462a1-10).

[19] Cf. *Poetics* 1.1447a18-b32; *Physics* ii. 2. 194a11-b15; *Metaph.* vii. 7-8. The actual material, or means, though valuable and indispensable, is of less importance in itself than the specific substance or essential form (cf. *Poetics* 1.1447b13-20; 6.1450a15 ff.; 24.1460b3-5; 25.1461b15-21). The means of oral interpretation—voice—is defined by Aristotle as "significant spoken sound" (cf. *On the Generation of Animals* v. 7.786b19-22; *On the Soul* ii. 8.420b5-421a6), such significance deriving from the mind's content, which, in the mimesis, is the substance or essence of the object imitated.

poem is conceived as a mimetic activity of empathizing into and visualizing the whole poem to express convincingly, in the dramatic manner, the thought, emotions, state of character, and total act, through the proper management of pitch, volume, rhythm, and other qualities of voice and bodily action. The poet himself, however, is responsible for the basic tonal qualities in the diction, such as assonance and alliteration; the interpreter may make special note of them, but they are not properly part of his art. Rhythm, on the other hand, is always influenced by the interpreter to some extent, particularly if he distorts it; therefore it should be included in the proper sphere of his art. Problems of emphasis are common to other arts and are solved in terms of one or more of the basic three speech qualities; therefore they are not thought of as constituting a separate division of the interpreter's art. Bodily action is a circumstantial part except as it aids empathic response, since a role may be convincingly portrayed without it.

Although Aristotle believed that dramatic ability cannot be taught systematically, he implies that once the visualizing and empathizing have been successfully accomplished, the management of pitch, volume, rhythm, and bodily action may follow more or less automatically. However, an important point for modern conceptions and developments of oral interpretation is that a mimetic art presents things in a somewhat different material or means from what is found originally in the object imitated. Oral reading has actual spoken sound as its means; a lyric poem possesses not actual sounds but written words which are the symbols of spoken words;[20] thus in the art of oral reading a somewhat separate development is possible in certain voice qualities—such as body and timbre or tone color—that are only potentially in the poem; separate development is similarly possible in the art of pantomime. In keeping with his general attitude,[21] however, Aristotle would probably maintain that most such matters, in so far as they are important at all, in large part take care of themselves once the *essentials* of visualization and empathy in given instances have been mastered. This attitude seems to account in part for the slight treatment of delivery in general; it is at least partly responsible, also, for the judgment that diction, music, and spectacle are less important to poetry than action, character, and thought. Speech is first the means of portrayal, second something to be beautiful itself. Lying behind the attitude is the general epistemological principle that the total object must be perceived in its own essential form before any further judgments, definitions, descriptions, or interpretations can be made.

Moreover, in keeping with his general logical and methodological principles, Aristotle would probably consider it unnecessary to lay down entirely separate rules in oral reading for such elements as locating the subjects and predicates, discovering meanings of individual words

[20] *On Interpretation* 1.16a3-8; cf. *On the Soul* ii. 8.420b5-421a6.

[21] Cf. *Prior Analytics* i. 25-28; *Posterior Analytics* i. 1-2, ii. 13.96b15-97b40; *On the Soul* iii. 4-8; *Physics* i. 1; *On Generation and Corruption* i. 2.316a5-14; *On the Parts of Animals* i. 1.642a25-30, 3.643b27-644a10; *Nic. Eth.* i. 3. Poetry, rhetoric, politics, ethics, are not, however, such exact sciences that ambiguity and misconception can always be prevented easily; as he says, *ibid.*: "Our discussion will be adequate if it has as much clearness as the subject-matter admits of, for precision is not to be sought for alike in all discussions, any more than in all the products of the crafts." (Cf. also *Poetics* 25.1460b13-15: "It is to be remembered, too, that there is not the same kind of correctness in poetry as in politics, or indeed any other art"; Aristotle is speaking here about what the poet presents, not what the critic says, but the principle is the same.)

and phrases, becoming aware of proper subordinations and coordinations. Once (1) the whole literary work has been perceived and conceived in its own genus and species—the what—and (2) the proper visualization and empathic response has been achieved—the how—then, for elaborations and developments in oral interpretation, the more general principles of simple expressions,[22] complex expressions,[23] and arguments[24] as set forth in different ways in his logical, rhetorical, and poetic treatises can be used accurately and profitably. But these principles of signification cannot be used properly before the crucial literary perception takes place, because the general principles themselves change in significance as the immediate context of application changes from mimetic poems to didactic arguments to philosophical treatises. The ten verbal categories, for example, may apply methodologically to univocal expressions[25] when the context is logic *per se* or natural sciences, to metaphorical expressions[26] when the context is dramatic poems, and to equivocal expressions and probabilities[27] when the context is dialectic or rhetoric. Or these distinctions among kinds of signification may be reversed in metaphysical, ethical, and poetic discourse when looked at in terms of subject matter rather than method.

IV

To outline these basic general principles of signification in more detail would be an extensive task. Perhaps enough has been set forth to characterize the Aristotelian approach to what is peculiar and essential to the art of oral interpretation. It remains only to summarize the main points: first, the Aristotelian approach to oral interpretation requires (1) adequate grasp of the principles of literary works to be interpreted, (2) vivid perception of the specific work at hand, (3) empathic response on the part of the interpreter. Second, from these principles we may conclude that in Aristotle's general philosophy knowledge and direct experience of the literary object is of primary importance and will largely determine the character of the oral interpretation. Third, when the poem is treated as an imitation of an action, the act of the oral interpreter will be essentially the same as the act of character portrayal and presentation of the art of acting. Finally, the Aristotelian approach in no way invalidates or discredits the current opinion that oral interpretation may provide a useful means of studying literature; indeed, this conclusion would follow easily from Aristotle's own emphasis on close scrutiny of the empirical object. In the philosophy of Aristotle, however, oral interpretation of a poem could never precede gathering knowledge of it as a particular kind of literary work, for such a procedure would concede to oral interpretation superhuman qualities, a higher awareness not within the province of human logic, except as human logic should acknowledge the existence of spontaneous and unconscious understanding, or "playing by ear."

[22] *Categories; Poetics* 20.1457a6-22 and chs. 21-22.

[23] *On Interp.; Poetics* 20-22.

[24] *Poetics* 20.1457a23-30; *Topics; On Sophistical Refutations; Rhetoric; Post. Anal.; Prior Anal.* Aristotle's logical treatises exclude Rhetoric and Poetics, which are specifically different arts; later un-Aristotelians and Aristotelians alike have usually failed to grasp this basic fact, as even St. Thomas, in his *In libros Posteriorum analyticorum expositio* i, Lectio 1, makes them the seventh and eighth branches of the Organon.

[25] Cf. *Categories* 1.1a6-12; *On Interp.* 6.17a35-37.

[26] Cf. *Poetics* 25.1460b12-14.

[27] Cf. *Rhetoric* ii. 23.1397a19-22, 1398a15-28; *Topics* i. 18.108a18-37, etc.

THE FORUM

A NEW STAFF

With this issue, the current editor of *QJS* completes his tenure and transfers his duties to Professor Wilbur S. Howell of Princeton University. We bespeak for the new staff the good wishes of the membership of the Speech Association of America. We could wish for the new editor no better fortune than to receive from the members of his staff the kind of loyal, patient, and thoughtful collaboration given to the retiring editor by his colleagues in *QJS*.

The readers and writers of *QJS* are asked hereafter to refer inquiries, recommendations, or manuscripts to the appropriate member of the new staff as follows: *American Public Address:* Robert D. Clark, Assistant Dean, College of Liberal Arts, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon; *British Public Address:* Donald C. Bryant, Department of English, Washington University, Saint Louis 5, Missouri; *Discussion:* Carroll C. Arnold, Department of Speech and Drama, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York; *Drama:* E. J. West, Department of English and Speech, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado; *Forensics:* Norman W. Mattis, Department of English, Speech Division, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina; *Homiletics:* John J. Rudin II, The Divinity School, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina; *Interpretation:* Joseph F. Smith, Department of Speech, University of Hawaii, Honolulu 14, T.H.; *New Books in Review:* Leland M. Griffin, Department of English, Washington University, Saint Louis 5, Missouri; *Phonetics:* Lee S. Hultzén, Speech Research Laboratory, 321 Illini Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois; *Propaganda and Public Opinion:* Ross Scanlan, Department of Public Speaking, College of the City of New York, New York 31, New York; *Radio and Television:* Giraud Chester, Department of Speech, Queens College, Flushing 67, New York; *Rhetoric:* Frederick W. Haberman, Department of Speech, University of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wisconsin; *Semantics:* Irving J. Lee, The School of Speech, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois; *Speech Pathology:* Wendell Johnson, The Speech Clinic, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; *Teaching of Speech:* Jane Dorsey Zimmerman, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York 27, New York; *The American Speech Teacher:* Loren D. Reid, Department of Speech, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Members of the association, particularly the chairmen of departments, are requested to keep in close touch with Professor Loren D. Reid, who will have in charge the section on The American Speech Teacher. This section will include items of general interest to members of the profession.

We should be most thoughtless if in this final issue we failed to express appreciation not only to the members of the staff whose names appear at the masthead, but also to many other persons who have given generously of their thought and effort in our attempt to maintain *QJS* at the standard reached in previous years. Special thanks are due to Mrs. Annie C. Leavenworth of Crawfordsville, Indiana, who has proofread every issue with professional care; and

to Mr. Nelson H. Meriwether, publisher, whose personal pride in presenting *QJS* in attractive format has been a constant stimulant to endeavor.

B. A.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Professor Orville Hitchcock
Executive Secretary
Speech Association of America
12 East Bloomington Street
Iowa City, Iowa

Professor Dallas Dickey, Editor
The Speech Teacher
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Professor Bower Aly, Editor
Quarterly Journal of Speech
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

In accordance with the provisions of Article IX of the Constitution of the Speech Association of America, we petition for the consideration of a Constitutional amendment herewith described at the next annual meeting of the Speech Association of America, to be held at the Hotel Statler in New York City during the period December 27-30, 1953:

Amend Article VI Section 1 by striking out the words stricken in the following copy, and inserting the words inserted therein:

ARTICLE VI

Duties of Councilors

Section 1. The Executive Council shall consist of: the President, the Executive Vice-President, the Executive Secretary, the Editor of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, the Editor of *Speech Monographs*, and the Editor of the *Speech Teacher* for the terms of their respective offices and for three years thereafter; *twelve* [twenty-four] members, elected at large, *four* [eight] each year, for a term of three years; the Vice-President; the members of the Finance Committee; the President, or his representative, of the Western Speech Association, of the Southern Speech Association, of the Speech Association of the Eastern States, of the Central States Association, of the Pacific Speech Association, of the American Educational Theatre Association, of the American Speech and Hearing Association, and of such other regional or special associations or federations as may hereafter be officially recognized by the Executive Council.

We further propose amending Article III Section 1 of the By-laws as shown herewith:

ARTICLE III

Election of Officers

Section 1. The President, First and Second Vice-Presidents; and *four* [eight] of the *twelve* [twenty-four] members of the Executive Council to be chosen at large shall be elected by the Association at each annual meeting; the First Vice-President in any year shall automatically succeed to the presidency for the following year.

If the proposed amendments should be adopted, we suppose that the following positions would be subject to the action of the Nominating Committee (Article III Section 2) to be chosen at the convention in New York (December 27-30, 1953), and to the subsequent action of the annual meeting next ensuing:

(a) Eight Councilors for a term of three years;
(b) Four Councilors for a term of two years;
(c) Four Councilors for a period of one year.

Respectfully submitted: Kenneth G. Hance, Loren D. Reid, C. M. Wise, Frederick W. Haberman, Bower Aly, Earnest Brandenburg, Wilbur E. Gilman, T. Earle Johnson, Donald C. Bryant, J. H. McBurney, Joseph F. Smith, C. T. Simon, Waldo W. Braden, Dallas C. Dickey, W. Norwood Brigance, J. Jeffery Auer, Magdalene Kramer, Robert D. Clark, Frank M. Rarig, Lester Thonssen, Paul D. Bagwell.

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

EARNEST BRANDENBURG, *Editor*

RECENT LITERATURE IN RHETORIC

Lester Thonssen

"For myself," said Quintilian in the preface to the *Institutes*, "as I consider that nothing is unnecessary to the art of oratory . . . I shall not shrink from stooping to those lesser matters, the neglect of which leaves no place for greater. . . ."[1] Accordingly, he proposed to consider, even though briefly, many matters of tangential concern which seemingly contributed to the training of the Perfect Orator. Were the art of rhetoric to be interpreted as literally and broadly, a review of recent literature on the subject would doubtless embrace practically everything printed during the specified time interval. Reviewers much more ambitious and knowledgeable than I would probably shrink from such an assignment. I turn, then, to the modest task of listing selected items which seem to reveal the spirit of recent writing in this area.[2]

Bibliographic Aids

Students of rhetoric will recall the difficulties experienced in the past in finding wholly satisfactory bibliographic guides to the literature on the subject. This problem arose in part from the apparently indeterminate meaning of the word *rhetoric*. Accordingly, items were often found, and still are for that matter, under *eloquence*, *oratory*, and other categories. Although these problems have not been wholly removed—and perhaps some of the satisfactions of scholarly inquiry would be lessened if they were—decided advances have been made. Since 1948, Frederick W. Haberman's annual "Bibliography of Rhetoric and Public Address"[3] has been of inestimable value to workers in our own and related fields. The supplemental guides furnished by the Auer,[4] Dow,[5] and Knower[6] indexes round out an excellent bibliographic coverage.

Mr. Thonssen (Ph.D., Iowa, 1931) is Professor of Speech at the College of the City of New York.

[1] *Institutes of Oratory* (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1856), 1, 3.

[2] I deliberately omit reference to the many textbooks and manuals on public address, since previous reviews have already dealt with them. Cf. Leland T. Chapin, "Source Materials for Speech at the College Level," *QJS*, XXXVI (October 1950), 408-415; Ralph G. Nichols, "Material for Courses in Communication," *Ibid.*, XXXVIII (December 1952), 465-469; J. Jeffery Auer, "Recent Literature in Discussion," *Ibid.*, XXXIX (February 1953), 95-98.

[3] *QJS*, XXXIV (October 1948), 277-299; *Ibid.*, XXXV (April 1949), 127-148; *Ibid.*, XXXVI (April 1950), 141-163; *SM*, XVIII (1951), 95-121; *Ibid.*, XIX (1952), 79-102; *Ibid.*, XX (1953), 79-107.

[4] J. Jeffery Auer, "Doctoral Dissertations in Speech: Work in Progress," *SM*, XVIII (1951), 162-172; *Ibid.*, XIX (1952), 103-111; *Ibid.*, XX (1953), 108-119.

[5] Clyde W. Dow, "Abstracts of Theses in the Field of Speech," *SM*, XIII (1946), 99-121; *Ibid.*, XIV (1947), 187-218; *Ibid.*, XV (1948), 188-249; *Ibid.*, XVI (1949), 290-363; *Ibid.*, XVII (1950), 227-329; *Ibid.*, XVIII (1951), 173-250; *Ibid.*, XIX (1952), 112-156, 157-203; *Ibid.*, XX (1953), 120-156.

[6] Franklin H. Knower, "Graduate Theses—An Index of Graduate Work in Speech," *SM*, II (1935), 1-49; *Ibid.*, III (1936), 1-20; *Ibid.*, IV (1937), 1-16; *Ibid.*, V (1938), 1-15; *Ibid.*, VI (1939), 1-19; *Ibid.*, VII (1940), 1-21; *Ibid.*, VIII (1941), 1-22; *Ibid.*, IX (1942), 1-27; *Ibid.*, X (1943), 1-12; *Ibid.*, XI (1944), 1-8; *Ibid.*, XII (1945), 1-29; *Ibid.*, XIII (1946), 122-129; *Ibid.*, XIV (1947), 219-226; *Ibid.*, XV (1948), 250-263; *Ibid.*, XVI (1949), 364-380; *Ibid.*, XVII (1950), 180-207; *Ibid.*, XVIII (1951), 135-161; *Ibid.*, XIX (1952), 204-234.

Of genuine interest and value to students and teachers of public address is the reproduction on 35 mm microfilm of some 40,000 pages of original material on British and Continental rhetoric and elocution. In cooperation with the Speech Association of America, University Microfilms of Ann Arbor has brought out the 16-reel series containing source materials not readily available to the greater part of our membership.[7]

Works on the Theory and Criticism of Rhetoric

The division between theory and criticism is admittedly arbitrary. The two features interlace in one way or another. A wide variety of recent publications dealing generally with the art of rhetoric will be considered in one group. Some of the books treat the subject rather specifically; others have a somewhat more indirect relationship to the central core of our area of inquiry.

Insight into rhetorical theory is provided by certain histories of literature and of criticism. Important among such items are the contributions of J. W. H. Atkins, whose *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*[8] is well known to all. In his *English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase,*[9] he traces the influence of ancient rhetoric upon the medieval period. Particularly relevant sections are those dealing with Bede, Alcuin, and John of Salisbury.

In *English Literary Criticism: The Renascence,*[10] Atkins assays the humanistic aims of the period, emphasizing in some detail the influence of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian upon the cultural development of the time. Atkins elaborates on the theme of Cicero's and Quintilian's "undisputed prestige" in giving inspiration and direction to the intellectual awakening. Signs of the new rhetorical conception, essentially classical, are found in the works of Cox, Sherry, Rainolde, Peacham, Fraunce, Ascham, and Wilson. Atkins discusses extensively the large conception of rhetoric developed by Wilson.

The contribution of Atkins to our fuller understanding of the rhetorical tradition is rounded out in his *English Literary Criticism: 17th and 18th Centuries.*[11] Here he traces the cross-currents of critical inquiry from about 1650 to 1800.

A relatively recent work dealing directly with rhetorical theory and criticism is the monograph entitled *Papers in Rhetoric,*[12] edited by Donald C. Bryant. The publication contains informative studies of "Thomas Wilson's Contributions to Rhetoric," "The Positions of Argument," "Early English Rhetoricians on the Structure of Rhetorical Prose," "The Rhetoric of Notker La-

[7] *British and Continental Rhetoric and Elocution* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1953), 14 pp. The following institutions cooperated in allowing original materials to be filmed: Library of Congress, British Museum, University of Glasgow, Harvard University, Union Theological Seminary, Boston Public Library, Princeton University, Folger Shakespeare Library, Oxford University (Bodleian), Newberry Library, Yale University, University of Michigan, Stanford University, Bibliothèque Nationale, Hamilton College, University of Illinois, Huntington Library. The following titles listed are selected at random as illustrating the scope and value of the series: Austin, Gilbert. *Chironomia.* London, 1806; Farnabii, Thomae. *Index rhetoricus.* Londini, 1646; Sheridan, Thomas. *A course of lectures on elocution.* Dublin, 1764; Sherry, Rychard. *A treatise of schemes & tropes.* (London, 1550); Vossius, G. J. *Commentarium rhetoricorum sive institutionum.* Lugduni Batavorum, 1630; Walker, J(ohn). *Exercises for improvement in elocution.* London, 1777; Wilson, Thomas. *The arte of rhetorique.* London, 1553; Vivis, Ioannis Lodovici. *De consultatione.* (1553).

[8] (London: Cambridge University Press, 1934).

[9] (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948).

[10] (London: Methuen and Co., 1947).

[11] (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1951).

[12] (St. Louis: Privately Printed, 1940).

beo," "A Rhetorical Theory for a History of Public Speaking in the United States," "Factors Contributing to Inaccuracy in the Text of Speeches," and "The Influence of Verbalisms in American Political Campaign Speaking."

Another work dealing specifically with rhetorical theory and criticism is *Speech Criticism*[13] by Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird. This book traces the origins of rhetorical theory and considers the standards of judgment for the appraisal of orators and oratory.

A host of distinctive works on literature has added significantly to our general understanding of the theory of rhetoric. Among the many are such contributions as Thomas Clark Pollock's *The Nature of Literature*,[14] containing a penetrating analysis of the uses of language; John Crowe Ransom's *New Criticism*,[15] with its discerning notes on the application of various criteria—logical, historical, etc.—to the appreciation and understanding of literary forms; Marvin T. Herrick's *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555*,[16] presenting pertinent material on the interrelation of theories of rhetoric and poetry; David Daiches' *A Study of Literature*,[17] with its relevant inquiries into the problems of the critics and the varieties of literary values; René Wellek and Austin Warren's *Theory of Literature*;[18] Kenneth Burke's *Philosophy of Literary Form*,[19] *Grammar of Motives*,[20] and *Rhetoric of Motives*;[21] Wayne Shumaker's *Elements of Critical Theory*;[22] and R. S. Crane and others' *Critics and Criticism: Ancient and Modern*.[23]

Certain special studies throw light on the rhetorical tradition of the Elizabethan and later periods. Alexander H. Sackton's *Rhetoric as a Dramatic Language in Ben Jonson*[24] traces the influence of rhetoric on Jonson's use of language and on his knowledge of audiences. There is also the fine study by Donald L. Clark dealing with *Milton at St. Paul's School: A Study of Ancient Rhetoric in English Renaissance Education*;[25] and the critical edition of passages from *The Public Speaking of Queen Elizabeth*,[26] by George P. Rice, Jr.

In addition to theses and articles in *Speech Monographs*[27] dealing with systems of rhetoric developed by our predecessors, several full-length studies of genuine stature have appeared during the past few years. Following the publication of *The Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne*, Wilbur S. Howell presented in 1951 his equally useful edition of *Fénelon's Dialogues on Eloquence*,[29] together with critical introduction and notes. Karl Wallace's exacting analysis

[13] (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1948).
[14] (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1942).
[15] (Norfolk, Conn.: New Directions, 1941).
[16] *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, XXXII, No. 1 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946).
[17] (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1948).
[18] (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949).
[19] (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1941).
[20] (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1945).
[21] (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950).
[22] (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952).
[23] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952).
[24] (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948).
[25] (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948).
[26] (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).
[27] Space does not permit the listing of the many fine papers that have appeared in *Speech Monographs* during the past ten years or so. Suffice it to note that such a list would include, for example, the series on the development of rhetorical theory in America by Warren Guthrie and the analysis of John Ward's rhetorical system by Douglas Ehninger.
[28] (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1941).
[29] (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1951).

of the Baconian system of rhetoric[30] and Robert M. Schmitz's study of Hugh Blair[31] continue to be most helpful to students of rhetorical theory. And the facsimile reproduction of Richard Rainolde's *Foundacion of Rhetorike*,[32] with an introductory essay by Francis R. Johnson, makes this work readily accessible.

Of the twenty or more papers in *Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond*,[33] several deal specifically with rhetorical theory and history. Of particular relevance to this inquiry are the late Russell Wagner's "Meaning of Dispositio," Harry Caplan's "The Decay of Eloquence at Rome in the First Century," the late Hoyt Hudson's translation of Erasmus' *Compendium Rhetorices*, and Karl Wallace's study of Analogy.

Two final items in this necessarily incomplete list of contributions to rhetorical theory are: Elbert W. Harrington's "Rhetoric and the Scientific Method of Inquiry—A Study of Invention,"[34] and Norman E. Nelson's "Peter Ramus and the Confusion of Logic, Rhetoric, and Poetry."[35]

The Criticism of Orators

Critical assessments of oratory and of individual orators continue to appear in considerable numbers, chiefly in the form of graduate theses. An examination of the annual Knower, Auer, and Dow lists is sufficient to confirm the observation. An impressive body of information has been assembled, much of which, regrettably, remains generally unavailable except through inter-library loan services. Only the occasional thesis finds its way into public print. Among the recent ones may be mentioned William Norwood Brigance's *Jeremiah Sullivan Black*,[36] Loren Reid's *Charles James Fox: A Study of the Effectiveness of an Eighteenth Century Parliamentary Speaker*,[37] Bower Aly's *The Rhetoric of Alexander Hamilton*,[38] Dallas Dickey's *Seargent S. Prentiss: Whig Orator of the Old South*,[39] and Wilbur Gilman's *Milton's Rhetoric: Studies in His Defense of Liberty*.[40] Many excellent short studies and abstracted versions of longer ones have appeared in *Speech Monographs*.

The most ambitious critical undertaking of recent years—one which takes its place in our tradition with Cicero's *Brutus* and Chauncey Goodrich's *Select British Eloquence*—is *The History and Criticism of American Public Address*,[41] edited by William Norwood Brigance. This fine publication is so widely known and favorably regarded as to need no further review in this column.

The orators also receive a chapter of critical comment in *The Literary History of the United States*.[42]

Postscript

Recent textbooks in public speaking reflect the renewed interest in the study

[30] *Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1943).

[31] *Hugh Blair* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1948).

[32] (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1945). Ethel Seaton's edition of *The Arcadian Rhetorike* by Abraham Fraunce is said to be now available.

[33] Ed. by Donald C. Bryant, Barnard Hewitt, Karl R. Wallace, and Herbert A. Wichelns (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1944).

[34] *University of Colorado Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 1 (Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 1948).

[35] *Contributions in Modern Philology*, No. 2 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1947).

[36] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934).

[37] (Iowa City, Iowa: Privately Printed, 1932).

[38] (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941).

[39] (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1945).

[40] *University of Missouri Studies*, XIV, No. 3 (Columbia: University of Missouri, 1939).

[41] Two vols. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1943).

[42] (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948), I, 541-562.

of rhetorical theory and history. Although adherence to the tradition of our subject obviously characterizes the earlier works as well, it seems to be particularly apparent in many recent books. Witness, for instance, the full chapters devoted to the historical background of the subject and the not infrequent reliance upon the testimony of the ancient and early modern authorities. On the other hand, an attempt on the part of some writers to articulate experimental findings with traditional theory is correspondingly evident.[43]

There is reason to believe that recent textbooks reflect the growing interest in rhetorical criticism. The problem of evaluation seems to receive even more detailed consideration than it used to. And the lessons learned from the studies of the great orators are finding their way into the practical manuals of speaking.

MAJOR CAMPAIGN SPEECHES OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON—1952. New York: Random House, 1953; pp. 320. $3.50.

The Stevenson speeches have been previously reviewed (*QJS*, XXXVIII, 402-406; XXXIX, 239) from the point of view of the campaign of 1952. This sampling of the speeches by a defeated candidate has been read into the record for the view of posterity. Fifty speeches are given. Nineteen of these were printed in *Speeches of Adlai Stevenson*, issued during the campaign. The new collection ranges from the first speech of national prominence, the Governor's welcome to fellow delegates at the Chicago convention, to the pathetic and generous concession of defeat made at Springfield early in the morning of November 5. The collection consists primarily of policy speeches on main issues, but included are a specimen of a chatty talk to campaign workers at a breakfast rally and even a whistle-stop effusion.

The speeches are prefaced with a review of campaign experiences, which originally appeared in *Life* (XXXIV, 94 ff.). The article has been revised to include references to the speeches: "they seem to cover much of what I wanted to say and said" (p. xiii). Retained (but expanded to 180 words) is the famous 178 word sentence describing a campaigner's run-on day (p. xii), a sentence which an emerita professor of English found time to diagram in two columns of newsprint (Josephine Meredith, Dickinson College. See *Champaign-Urbana Courier*, May 3, 1953, p. 4).

It is the destiny of the speech to have its hind legs amputated and its body molded into essay form before being shipped to the printer for embalming. In these speeches, too, those often long and grandiloquent salutations which sweep everyone of major or minor note into positions of high priority are omitted. Many paragraphs of purely local color, such as heart-warming tributes to regional candidates and remarks on the vagaries of fall weather, are expunged. But the volume is a collection of speeches; there has been no editing of the ideas from later perspective, no attempt to universalize or go beyond the margins of immediate setting. What Stevenson said, at a definite time and place, with minor deletions for the sake of the *reading* public, is here set forth.

It is an old-fashioned volume, done in the traditions of politic, rhetoric, and ethic. The moral restraint of the book, the tone of *ad astra per aspera*, will have little meaning to future readers who did not live through the campaign of '52. It is hazardous to bind together time and place speeches without settings and the words of the opposition. Future readers will have to dig out of newspaper files details of the blitz rhetoric of the opposition, of spot appeals selected by pollsters seeking to make local persuasive effects. They will have to discover that a United States Senator, Richard Nixon, now Vice President, canvassed Governor Stevenson's state proclaiming that the Governor "was duped by Communist Alger Hiss"; that another Senator, Joe McCarthy, a candidate for reelection and actually reelected, threatened and threatened to disclose all kinds of hidden subversive intentions in Stevenson's career, but produced little more on the television screen than a picture of a seditious Massachusetts barn; that General Eisenhower, rival candidate, and now President, was heard over and over on radio spot announcements; that his wife, referred to by him as "My Mamie," encountered difficulty in her shopping because of high prices, particularly the price of bread. The details of opposition are gone, although the cause was triumphant. The

[43] Examination of the abstract indicates that Hugo J. David has made an extensive study of a closely related matter in his doctoral dissertation entitled *Some Implications of Experimentalism for Teaching Public Speaking* (East Lansing: Michigan State College, 1952).

reader will have to recall or recreate them if he would understand the volume.

This "permanent" volume does not solve that age-old problem of rhetorical critics, the texts. In an age of mimeographs and electronics the matter of what actually was said on the spot should be a mere incidental, and critics should no longer have to take recourse to diaries, miscellaneous notes, and speculation. Stevenson says that he has "relied upon stenographic transcriptions in most cases," and in others has used his own notes to reconstruct what he "said as accurately as possible" (p. xiv). In accuracy the texts are an improvement over those in the earlier *Speeches*, and are obviously more generally useful than newspaper releases of pre-delivery texts. Several speeches are not so complete, however, as available press transcriptions. It is a pity a few explanatory details are not supplied in background, such as the nature and size of audience, and the environs. Stevenson says that he has in his files "whole or partial texts of some 250 speeches" (p. xi) made in the campaign, but "no record remains" of how many more he made. In the next presidential campaign, the Speech Association of America ought to have a representative with each candidate's cortege. The amanuensis could note what was said where and when, and the whole record could be deposited in the archives. Perhaps the candidates' interest in what actually was said could be developed. A complete record of speeches could be kept. For example, on the last Stevenson train East, stenographers took down what was said from the rear platform, mimeographers went to work, and twenty minutes after the first words were uttered first sheets were available in the press car.

Another problem of the texts is who wrote what was said. It is well known that Stevenson made a gallant effort to write his own speeches, and that on tour he put his primary attention on what he was to say rather than on handshaking and miscellaneous conviviality. But as the campaign increased in fury, he was compelled to draw upon the rhetorical resources of such men as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Archibald MacLeish, and Herbert Agar. Stevenson referred to this matter in his non-reported but well circulated Gridiron speech of December 13, 1952: "If you want to raise this ghostly subject, I should be willing to open my speech writing books, if the Luce publications and *Reader's Digest* will open theirs." That many hands were at work he acknowledged: "I became very familiar with the sound of my own voice. I hope the Recording Angel will note that I did not say the sound of my own words." Whoever wrote this or that part of the speeches reversed Dr. Johnson and took pains to see that the Tory dogs did not get the best of it.

It is good to have a collection of speeches in the best-seller list; *Major Campaign Speeches* has held to the list since the first week of publication. One can only speculate what the reason may be. Perhaps people want a souvenir of a hundred-million-dollar campaign; perhaps they are expressing admiration for the man and the way he conducted the campaign; perhaps some readers are "conscience" patrons, who could not bring themselves to put an X in the Stevenson box, but took the trouble to write him post-election expressions of esteem. Or perhaps, and we would like to think this is true, it is a reaffirmation of basic human interest in speeches high in literary and ethical quality.

RICHARD MURPHY,
University of Illinois

TRUTH IS OUR WEAPON. By Edward W. Barrett. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1953; pp. xviii+355. $4.00.

The operation of a broad-gauged propaganda campaign on an international scale is essentially a rhetorical enterprise. Its success depends on the skill with which it analyzes its audience and chooses its appeals, and the ingenuity with which it conveys these appeals to peoples of foreign lands through the available media of communication—radio, films, television, educational and cultural exchanges, libraries, leaflets, magazines, etc. This is the thesis ably argued by Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs (including the Voice of America) from 1950 to 1952 and, during World War II, a top executive in the Psychological Warfare Branch of the Army and director of international operations for the Office of War Information.

Mr. Barrett supports his thesis with a wealth of illustrative material drawn from his governmental service, particularly his direction of the "Campaign of Truth" (Mr. Barrett's own phrase) launched by President Truman in 1950. The author's account of how he persuaded the State Department and the President to label their counter-propaganda efforts against the Soviet Union in positive instead of negative terms ("Truman Calls for Campaign of Truth" rather than "Truman Declares Propaganda War") is typical of the first-hand evidence at the author's disposal.

In the first half of *Truth is Our Weapon*, Mr. Barrett gives some wartime close-ups of combat psychological warfare that are especially illuminating. He reports that "Sykewar" officers, having learned that "to induce a German soldier to surrender, it is wise to assuage his pride and honor," addressed surrender demands over loudspeakers to a thousand holdout Nazi soldiers in Cherbourg and included the words, "You have fought bravely and distinguished yourselves. You have done honor to your country." The Germans surrendered *en masse*—but only after arrangements had been made for the German general in command to be threatened by a tank.

The author's two basic lessons in international persuasion strike a familiar note to rhetoricians: "1) There are persuasive ways and ineffective ways to say the same thing, and 2) To persuade effectively, choose themes that are meaningful and persuasive to the particular audience." Three additional propositions will also find wide support: 1) Actions speak louder than words, 2) There are no universally effective propaganda terms, and 3) The rhetoric of truth is the soundest propaganda and must not be compromised by resort to deceit. Mr. Barrett believes that such acts as the Berlin airlift, the defense of Korea, and the three-power disarmament proposals in 1951 constituted far more effective persuasion than speeches alone could achieve. He includes an excellent brief history of American activity in international propaganda and offers numerous constructive proposals for improvement. He believes that overall propaganda policy should be formulated in Washington, but the application of the policy to specific target countries should be made with the aid of local embassy officials who presumably are intimately acquainted with local feelings and attitudes. He urges the Administration to anticipate foreign reaction in preparing foreign policy statements and actions, and he calls for a joint congressional committee on international information.

No one reading Mr. Barrett's sober, thoughtful, and informed account of our efforts at international persuasion can escape a feeling of shame when he views the shambles to which a senatorial committee, through one-sided public hearings and statements, recently reduced the Voice of America and the rest of our informational program.

Students of international broadcasting and propaganda should consider this book required reading. The suggestion is also pertinent that our governmental chiefs of propaganda might do well to keep a copy of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* on their desks and include it in their bibliographies. Lessons in persuasion might not then have to be learned the hard and costly way—through trial and error. It is comforting to know that the Greek master still holds his own.

GIRAUD CHESTER,
Queens College

EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY. By Edmund Ezra Day. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1952; pp. 203. $2.50.

MODERN EDUCATION AND HUMAN VALUES. By Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Philip Rhys Adams, Samuel H. Goldenson, Clyde Kluckhohn, and William G. Carr. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1952; p. 134. $3.00.

Eighteen selections by former President Day of Cornell are included in *Education for Freedom and Responsibility*. The editor, Milton R. Konvitz, labels them "essays," but a "note on sources" identifies them as addresses delivered between 1936 and Day's death in 1951. The contents are arranged in three divisions: General Education (e.g., "Responsibilities of General Education in a Free Society"); Higher Education (e.g., "A University and its Functions"); and Responsibility for Enduring Values (e.g., "Qualities of Democratic Leadership"). The volume needs an index.

Day's discourses, presented on such occasions as his inauguration, an annual gathering of the Association of Land Grant Colleges, a meeting of the Association of American Universities, and the New York State CIO convention, reflect his "progressive analysis" and constructive interpretation of the educational needs of these revolutionary decades. Day, for example, endorses general education. He insists that such education must connect more directly with "the pursuit of truth, with social understanding, with social sympathy, with a philosophy of work, and with the everlasting imperatives of a free society." He denounces the fragmentation of the educational program and argues for integration. Uppermost in his thinking in every address is his insistence upon the "untrammeled pursuit of truth" and the moral order in American democracy. He comes to grips with the problem of individual expression in the face of science and technology, mass education, and universal suffrage. He argues that the equilibrium between individual growth and social solidarity can be best achieved

through educational emphasis on the "basic moral and religious needs of our time."

What of Liberal Education? To Day it can be saved only through reorientation to resist the shackles of scientific research and excessive specialization. Such education must be continuous. "Liberal education," he says, "must be in part adult education." To Day "the teacher is the one key necessary to the solution" of our educational problems.

Speech teachers will find in the Day "essays" reaffirmation of much that is important in educational philosophy. Although hardly original in their basic thinking or expression, they do suggest some uniqueness in their approach to specific educational programs related to science, mass communication, and social revolution. He takes a clear-cut, unequivocal stand in support of intellectual and academic freedom and in opposition to all movements toward educational reaction.

Day's style is on the whole prosaic, abstract, colored by few personal references. The addresses keep aloof from much of the hysteria and historical drama of the years and have little of the brisk concreteness of Robert Hutchins. But the volume is worth review by those who would trace educational statesmanship, as embodied in the public addresses of Charles W. Eliot, Nicholas Murray Butler, Woodrow Wilson, Edwin A. Alderman, David Starr Jordan, William Rainey Harper, and James B. Conant.

Modern Education and Human Values contains five lectures delivered under a grant from the Pitcairn-Crabbe Foundation at the University of Pittsburgh, during the college years of 1950-51 and 1951-52.

Arthur Vanderbilt of the New Jersey Supreme Court stresses the contribution of law in conserving human values and the present goal of protecting essential liberties. Adams, director of the Cincinnati Art Museum, develops the need for a historic sense and finds the avenue to such sense in "the vital stuff of history, the arts." Goldenson, rabbi emeritus of Congregation Emanu-El, New York City, reviews the moral challenge to education. Kluckhohn of Harvard University traces the problems of universal values in relation to anthropological relativism. To him values are universal; our society can be heathy and strong only when a set of common values is expressed so as to give meaning and purpose to our group life. We must learn to "speak once more in the international realm with a clear philosophy." The failure of civilization is partly the failure of communication. Carr, executive secretary of the National Educational Association, discusses "values in teaching." He argues for the more effective use of education in building American prosperity. He is mundane and realistic in his economic treatment of values. His concentration on education as economic wisdom would no doubt appeal to many American minds.

The five Pittsburgh lectures thus treat human values in education from the legal, aesthetic, moral, anthropological, and economic approaches. Speech teachers would quickly note the need for an added lecture on communication in the conservation of human values. But these scholarly addresses will repay close reading for their contribution to the literature of educational foundations.

A. Craig Baird,
State University of Iowa

IMPATIENT CRUSADER. By Josephine Goldmark. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953; pp. xii+217. $3.50.

This is a biography of Florence Kelley, a well-known speaker in the first third of the twentieth century. Mrs. Kelley, appointed Chief Inspector of Factories in Illinois in 1893, was the first woman to hold such a position. Between that time and her death in 1932 at the age of 74, she was identified with practically all the important movements for social reform. She was connected especially with the National Consumers League movement, for which she served as General Secretary from 1899, the crusade against child labor, the campaign for safe working conditions in stores and factories, the founding of the U. S. Children's Bureau, the clearing of tenements, and the securing of minimum wage and hour laws.

Mrs. Kelley worked at Hull House in her early days. One of the militant group of social reformers which included Jane Addams, Julia Lathrop, and Lillian Wald, she dedicated her life to the improvement of living and working conditions for the American people. Feeling that the best way to secure legislative reforms was through understanding and support on the part of the mass of the citizens, she did much speaking and writing, and was greatly in demand as a speaker even while still at Hull House. In support of the first factory law in Illinois she and her colleagues at Hull House made speeches every night for a period of three months. Later, in her annual report to the Consumers League for 1903, Mrs. Kelley noted that during the past year she had made 111 speeches in 15 different states. This is the

pace to which she kept throughout her life.

The author says that Mrs. Kelley "had preeminently the speaker's gift"; she spoke from knowledge and conviction. Contemporary accounts indicate that she had the ability to make people see and feel the deplorable conditions under which many of their compatriots lived. She also could make clear complicated laws and regulations, to show what they could and could not do. An excellent research worker, she based her appeals always on facts and figures. As Felix Frankfurter writes in the Foreword, "She based her efforts for legislative reforms on wide popular support, the support of a public educated to its responsibility, and asserting it not with the ardor of rhetoric but with the impact of hard fact."

The author, Josephine Goldmark, who died before the book was published, was associated with Mrs. Kelley in the Consumers League. An important social reformer in her own right, she gives us in *Impatient Crusader* a sympathetic yet fair and objective picture of one of the outstanding female speakers of our century. The book does not offer a systematic study of Mrs. Kelley as a speaker, but the references to her speechmaking are frequent and revealing. The teacher of public speaking will find this biography stimulating and worthwhile.

ORVILLE HITCHCOCK,
State University of Iowa

WINSTON CHURCHILL: THE ERA AND THE MAN. By Virginia Cowles. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953; pp. 378. $5.00.

This latest portrait of Churchill by journalist Virginia Cowles is neither a great biography nor *the* biography of the British orator, but it is perhaps the best and most complete biographical treatment he has had to date. It offers the usual chronological coverage from his birth at Blenheim to his second premiership at the end of 1951. The author presents some bits of new material, including recent personal impressions gleaned as a friend of the Churchill family, but for the most part the book is based on published works.

Miss Cowles has been more successful than other biographers in explaining and interpreting the orator's motives and meanderings during his long and checkered political life. She has given more attention to his speaking than have most others. The book suggests in several places that Churchill did not always understand his British audience, but this idea appears incidentally and receives no systematic analysis. The author recognizes that Churchill's power as a speaker contributed as much to his success as any other ability. In listing his claims to distinction as the first world war opened, she places this attribute first (p. 173).

The book contains many references to Churchill's speaking. At least two quotations offer amusing insight into his practices. F. E. Smith remarked that Churchill "had devoted the best years of his life to his impromptu speeches." Referring to a criticism of the orator for his support of a Russian alliance, the author quotes Churchill: "If Hitler invaded Hell I would make at least a favourable reference to the Devil in the House of Commons."

This book may be helpful to the rhetorical critic interested in the Prime Minister's oratory, since it supplies background information and some interpretation of the circumstances and events in which Churchill was a central figure.

HALBERT E. GULLEY,
University of Illinois

THE WRITTEN WORD AND OTHER ESSAYS. By Hardin Craig. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953; pp. x+90. $3.00.

The six lectures delivered before the Centre College of Kentucky which, with a brief Preface and Postscript, make up this small volume are comments on disparate literary figures and topics, unified by two recurring themes: 1) that given the opportunity great writers can "obliterate time and resuscitate truth" for readers in any age and 2) that, as the author wrote in the General Introduction to his *Shakespeare* (Chicago, 1931), "never has the spirit of a race and an age been so active and so bold" as in the period of the Renaissance.

The first and title lecture explores the role of literature in enlarging man's comprehension of universal truths and enters a plea for an end to that kind of specialization which keeps humanists in want of a deep understanding of science and denies to our time the enthusiasm for a "vast unity" which energized the thought of the Renaissance era. "The Vitality of an Old Classic: Lucian and Lucianism" illustrates "the principle of vitality in literature" and concludes that they are "discoveries in the realm of mind" and "inventions in thought" which survive and bear lively messages from age to age. The third and fourth lectures, "Hamlet and Ophelia" and "These Juggling Fiends: On the Meaning of *Macbeth*," are aptly characterized in the Preface as "intimate bits of Shakespeare interpretation." The first ex-

amplifies and analyzes the tragic consequences of imperfect understanding and the second the anatomy and comportment of Evil. "Burns and the Lowland Scotch" is an informal treatise on the Lowland Scotch dialect and the average reader's difficulties in understanding and appreciating "the greatest poet of ordinary life." The final, and for this reviewer the most important, lecture in this group is "An Ethical Distinction by John Milton," an examination of the moral duties of man as set forth in Milton's *De doctrina Christiana*. The distinction which Professor Craig here amplifies is that "the achievement of goodness in human life means being something virtuous rather than doing something virtuous," and the latter portion of his treatment applies this distinction to definitions of social and political liberty and to the ends of religious thought and behavior.

All that is said in this volume is addressed to the problem of what constitutes the essential objective in the creation or study of meritorious general and dramatic literature. In each lecture the author illustrates with new material his consistent answer that this objective is to clarify and perfect man's understanding of himself and the world about him. Professor Craig has not sought in these discourses to report or comment on scholarly research as such; he offers, rather, lay sermons on selected texts from literature. Originally addressed to the general body of students and faculty at Centre College, the lectures as now published retain their broad and popular appeal. Those who have had the good fortune to hear the author's classroom lectures will be pleased that so little of his warmth and wit has been lost in the preparation of these pieces for publication.

The volume has no index and none seems needed. The brief Postscript with which the book closes is a generalized restatement of the central themes informing the six lectures.

CARROLL C. ARNOLD,
Cornell University

GENERAL EDUCATION IN SCHOOL AND COLLEGE: A COMMITTEE REPORT. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953; pp. v+142. $2.00.

College professors rarely read books on education because they usually find such books boringly diffuse and unoriginal. *General Education in School and College*, though diffuse and unoriginal in parts, contains much that is novel and concrete.

Each of the six authors is a teacher of proved competence in an outstanding college or school: Princeton, Yale, Harvard, Lawrenceville, Exeter, Andover. Their object in working together was to discover paths to better interaction between secondary and higher education. The chief result of their study is a serious and arresting proposal for a continuous school-college curriculum. The costs of their inquiry were borne by the Ford Foundation Fund for the Advancement of Education.

The work of this "Committee of Six" grew out of certain historical developments—now generally considered calamitous—in American higher education. Around 1930 serious problems manifested themselves. Although it seemed reasonable to expect the college graduate to be a person of considerable cultural maturity, at least modestly literate in basic science, social studies, and the arts, this expectation was far from the fact. Instead, a discouraging and encompassing illiteracy was all too often the rule. Contributing factors were many: the growth of vocationalism and specialism, the demand for mass education, the decline of interest in the "solid subjects," abuse of the elective system, and sometimes an outright indifference of college faculties to the balanced cultural development of their students.

Reaction to these trends brought an epidemic of experimentation and reform which culminated in the movement usually referred to as "general education." Attacking the problem in a bewildering variety of ways, these experiments had as their common theme an uncompromising insistence that the objective of liberal education is liberally educated people. Emphasis was placed upon maturity and balance, coupled in the better colleges with discipline and depth.

An unsettled question was whether general education rightly belongs to the college or the school. And the wisest answer to this question has always appeared to be to both—hence the urgent need for a joint effort by schools and colleges to achieve a continuous curriculum. Such a curriculum seems needed in any case, because much that a student covers in school he repeats in college with unfortunate effects upon his individual morale and a tragic loss of momentum and time.

To meet this urgent need the authors of this book have devised a continuous program of studies to occupy a part of each student's time from the 9th to the 14th grades.

To readers nostalgic for the old days when a high school education had solid substance, the

proposals of the Committee will be a tonic. Nowadays, few high school students study more mathematics than that contained in a single dilute course in elementary algebra. But the Committee of Six asks for four full years of high school mathematics, intensified to incorporate elementary calculus and statistics. Equally refreshing is the stand of the Committee on foreign language: it prescribes four to five years before the student comes to college.

The report will raise the eyebrows of public school people by asking high schools to stick to history and leave social science to the colleges. The plan envisions two interdisciplinary courses, social-scientific in their approach, in western and modern American civilization, given to all students later in college. The report does not deal with the secondary education of the eighty per cent who do not go to college at all.

In the sciences, a variety of continuous curricula, varying with the student's aptitude and interest, are proposed. And in literature a planned program of readings is recommended, to replace the present chaotic absence of correlation between school and college. Welcome indeed is the insistence by the Committee upon the use of the best *and most difficult* books that students can profitably read. In fact, literature is but one of many areas in which the report urges that exacting standards, a stretching of the student's competence, be sought.

A significant by-product of a continuous curriculum is acceleration, which the Committee prefers to call "progress in strength." With real cooperation between school and college in determining the high school curriculum, colleges could afford to advance some students and enable them to finish in seven years instead of eight. Some readers may be disappointed that the Committee proposes such accelerated progress only for schools which, like their own, have impeccable academic standards, and only for a minority of students in such schools. Actually, initial limitation of the Committee's proposals to a project of controllable dimensions is typical of the practical wisdom that everywhere pervades the report.

One of the most interesting proposals is a required college course in Values. This suggestion stems from a disturbing discovery: students in the colleges whose representatives framed this report told the Committee that formal education had barely affected their personal esthetic and ethical standards, had failed them in the quest for a personal philosophy of life.

THOMAS S. HALL,
Washington University

INTEGRATIVE SPEECH. By Elwood Murray, Raymond H. Barnard, and J. V. Garland, in collaboration with Guthrie E. Janssen. New York: Dryden Press, 1953; pp. 617. $4.75.

The scope and purpose of *Integrative Speech* is clearly indicated by a glance at the following representative chapter titles: "Our Speech Opportunities and Obligations," "Communication Complexities and Disorders," "How We Find and Represent the Facts," "Basic Relations With Our Audience," "Gaining the Cooperation of Our Audience," "Semantic Disorders," "Audio-visual Aids and Dramatization," "Sociodrama Role-playing and Sociometry," "Leadership and Participation in Discussion," "Forensic Speech Activities."

The authors view speech instruction as the principal means of integrating our society, which, they say, is threatened by forces of diversification and disintegration. The chief tools a speaker may use in his efforts to synthesize the various social segments of which he becomes a part are General Semantics, discussion techniques, and the newer forms of sociodrama and role-playing. Excellent applications of all these tools are suggested with the conviction that when they are improved integrated personalities and more cohesive social groups will evolve.

Occasionally, the young student may be puzzled by what seems to be contradictory advice. For example, on page 25 he will read "Our main obligation, as we saw, was to make our use of speech *integrative* in its effect not only on our own character but also on the human associations in which we are involved," and later on page 44 he will be advised "that there is likely to be a point at which we should stop trying to make our use of speech integrative in its effect." Where that point is the student is not told, since such advice would be drawn, as Aristotle recognized, from politics and ethics, and since attempts to locate that point would in themselves be highly disintegrative in effect.

This book presents many challenges both to beginning students for whom it is intended and to instructors. Anyone wishing a traditional public speaking approach will probably be dissatisfied with it. Others desiring variety,

freshness, and challenge of old methods will find it catalytic in action.

The illustrations are superb from both an artistic and an educational point of view.

WILBUR E. MOORE,
Central Michigan College of Education

SPEECH FUNDAMENTALS. By Harry G. Barnes and Loretta Wagner Smith. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953; pp. 554. $3.45.

For many years book publishers and teachers of speech have vocalized the need of a textbook written specifically for a Fundamentals of Speech class at the secondary level. Up to this time, speech books have been written as *survey* texts with the suggestion that a grouping of certain chapters would provide sufficient material for the *one-semester first course in speech*. Therefore, the preliminary announcement of *Speech Fundamentals* by Barnes and Smith was received with delight.

In writing a review of a textbook, the reviewer has two alternatives: (1) to determine the objectives of the authors and to evaluate the work in terms of these objectives, and (2) to evaluate the book in terms of its usability in his particular teaching situation. This reviewer has elected to follow the latter procedure.

The general make-up of the book is highly desirable. It is attractively bound, is of convenient size, is easy to read, and has well-chosen type-face. However, the contrast in type between the text and the exercises seems unnecessary. The plan of dividing the book into six parts is good, although some may object to the materials included in these parts. A desirable feature is the division of each part into assignments instead of the usual chapter arrangement. This method of organization will facilitate the planning of the semester's work. The almost excessive use of exercises gives the book a lengthy appearance. One of the best mechanical features is the use of quotations on the first page of the first fifteen assignments, and the subsequent use of "quotations for the day" to introduce each of the following assignments. From the mechanical point of view, therefore, the book is good.

The first seventeen assignments are intended as an introduction to the course. If one day is used for each assignment, more than three weeks of the semester will be required for introductory purposes. Only four assignments are devoted to the Fundamental Processes of Speech, the real core of the book and of the first course. Such a distribution of time seems to place undue emphasis upon introductory materials and may force teachers to use the assignments in a different order from that suggested by the authors.

In discussing "Adjustment to the Speaking Situation," is not consideration of Audience Response necessary, both in reading aloud and speaking, as well as Control of Bodily Activity? Then why not include these items in the book at the time they are first required?

Moreover, the authors fail to appreciate that high school boys and girls of today are not satisfied with broad, general terms in descriptions of how to attain personal skills. For example, one paragraph on page 310, disposes of "Posture." Students are admonished: ". . . To have a good posture . . . your posture should be comfortable, natural, and normal. . . . The muscles of your body should not be stiff and tense." This reviewer believes that more specific information regarding the development of good posture should be given, or at least references should be supplied so that students may look up such information.

One of the real tests of a text is how well it is received by the students. It will be interesting to learn of actual class experiences with this book. The authors and publishers should be commended for this first effort to broaden the concepts of an important area, the first course in speech for high school students.

G. BRADFORD BARBER,
Illinois State Normal University

PROJECT TEXT FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Clark S. Carlile. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953; pp. 180. $2.00.

This text merits the attention of instructors of the fundamentals speech course in both high school and college. The book describes thirty-nine speech projects: Your First Speech, How to Prepare a Speech, The Introduction, The Conclusion, Recording a Speech, Personal Experience Speech, Pet Peeve Speech, Gesture Speech, Speech of Fear Confession, The Announcement, Introducing a Speaker, Speech to Inform, Good-Will Speech, Special Report, Speech to Convince, Heckling Speech, Speech to Stimulate, Presentation, Acceptance, Welcome, Response to a Welcome Speech, Farewell, Emotional Speech, Eulogy, Dedication, Anniversary, Speech to Get Action, Nominating Speech, Speech to Accept Office, Sales Talk, Humorous Speech, After-Dinner, Impromptu, Book Review, Manuscript Speaking, Radio Speaking, Panel Discussion, Symposium, and Lecture Forum.

The author explains the nature of the type of speech and gives terse instruction on the preparation and the presentation. Each chapter contains suggested speech topics, a bibliography, and a page for the speech outline which can be detached and given to the instructor, who returns it with written comments after hearing the speech.

The explanations of the speech types and suggestions to students are, in some chapters, too brief to be of much value. In general, however, the author has supplied a surprising amount of pertinent information in a limited space. The author states: "Although it is desirable that a person possess some knowledge of what lies behind the act of public speaking, the important criterion of success is his ability to demonstrate his power of speech. It is the speech that counts."

The outstanding feature of this text is its flexibility. The teacher has his choice of many projects. The book is also adaptable to large or small classes. Mr. Carlile has made a unique and valuable contribution to the literature of beginning speech courses.

A. E. WHITEHEAD,
University of Idaho

EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION: A GUIDE TO READING, WRITING, SPEAKING, AND LISTENING. By Howard H. Dean. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953; pp. 682. $4.95.

The author's concept of communication is set forth as follows: "Communication may be defined as a process of conveying mental or emotional concepts of any kind from one person to others by means of symbols." On the basis of this broad definition, his text becomes somewhat massive although he has made a fairly successful attempt to limit the scope of his concern. He has held himself rigidly to discussion of the four skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, but in doing this, has found it necessary to cover an extremely wide range of topics.

The book is divided into six parts: Fundamental Principles, Speech Skills, Informative Communication, Opinion and Persuasion, Mass Communication, and Standard English.

As far as this reviewer knows, this is the first major text dealing with communication that gives adequate balance to and shows clearly the relationships between all four of the communication skills. This is not another re-hash of texts for either freshmen composition or fundamentals of speech. The author has done an excellent job of synthesis. For example, his treatment of reading and listening together is a fine piece of work, and he has done a great service in showing the relationships and the common basic principles in these two skills. He has not been quite so successful in his treatment of writing and speaking as related skills; however, he saves the situation by his repeated admonition that "the sense of communicating ideas" is all important to the expressive skills.

This reviewer was much pleased with the author's treatment of mass communication. He seems to have done an excellent job of introducing the student to the principles and methods for reading and analyzing published materials and for viewing and listening to radio, television, and movie communication. His section on "Content Analysis" should be a must for every college student.

If the text has one noticeable weakness it is the failure to go beyond the development of skills of communication to a consideration of human behavior which may interfere with the application of any one of the skills even though ability is present. However, much already has been included; perhaps the omission is one of necessity rather than choice.

This text may prove to be the best of its kind yet published. It can be highly recommended at this point for a trial in communication courses now being taught in colleges and universities.

HEROLD LILLYWHITE,
University of Oregon

A CASE BOOK IN SPEECH THERAPY. By Charles Van Riper. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953; pp. 141. $2.75.

In an attempt to "bridge the gap between theory and practice in speech therapy" Van Riper presents the actual case of a girl with a severe articulatory problem. Part I of the *Case Book* deals with the examination and diagnosis of the case while Part II presents the therapeutic procedures followed by a student clinician in working on one defective sound.

As is usual in Van Riper's writing, the style is direct, interesting, and lively. The author's intent has been to "capture the very feel of speech therapy." It seems to this reviewer that he has succeeded extremely well. In using an authentic case he has included the clinicians' mistakes, doubts, and frustrations as well as their successes.

It should be remembered that the book is not

Since only seldom is one person able to discharge the function of general supervisor as the Broadway stage manager does, most non-professional groups need a large production staff. The supervisor's duties must be delegated to several workers according to their training and experience. Careful and wise delegation of responsibility may be of value to the group without being a detriment to the production, as groups have demonstrated where planning has been thorough and instruction adequate. In addition to listing the details of production which are frequently left to chance, the author includes valuable information on tryouts, casting, and prompting. Also, although the author appears to be unaware that non-professional groups do sometimes go on tour, approximately half the book is concerned with the specific problems of touring, including those involved in relations with stage unions. The book is practically complete in specific instructions for the stage manager, but the author has left a few gaps, since the information is available in other standard books on the theatre. A bibliography of the books he had in mind would have been useful.

LEWIS G. MCFARLAND,
Northern Illinois State Teachers College

THE SECRET OF PULPIT POWER. By Simon Blocker. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951; pp. 209. $3.00.

STIR UP THE GIFT. By Paul S. Rees. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1952; pp. 159. $2.00.

COMMUNION THROUGH PREACHING: THE MONSTRANCE OF THE GOSPEL. By Henry Sloane Coffin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952; pp. ix+124. $2.50.

For students of American public address who are conscious of the plan of religious speaking in the larger picture, three vastly different books of recent date have merit. Perusing the relatively brief volumes, one senses a note of growing urgency on the part of conservative and liberal theologians to emphasize the place of preaching in worship and in the changing of people's lives. Perhaps something new has been added to the process of motivation as the preacher is being trained to use it in persuasion. Certainly in the last of the trio, something definitely dramatic in the joint experience of speech and religion has been underscored.

The textual sermon is still one of the favorite types of religious address. Many writers have sought to champion it; others, to disguise it. Blocker presents it as "a fresh way of getting at the heart of a Bible passage." He styles it "thematic Christian preaching," since he suggests that student preachers place emphasis on thematic and structural coherence in their pulpit address. To make sure that the readers comprehend the different thematic sub-types, the author includes six full sermons as illustrations.

Representing a conservative type of Christian theology, Rees records seven lectures in a series on evangelistic preaching to ministerial students. Approaching his study primarily from the standpoint of church history, he notes a definite trend back to a style of preaching that "combines conciseness with comprehension." Therefore, students of religious address who are trying to discover the place of persuasiveness in all Christian witness will find his book both helpful and interesting.

Liberal Coffin believes that "both sermons and the Supper of the Lord are means of grace and media through which God in Christ offers Himself in personal fellowship." Coffin's purpose in delivering four brief lectures and publishing them is "to encourage sacramental sermons—sermons which enable God to have face-to-face communion with His people." Thus exalting the sermon as the "chief factor in the public worship of Almighty God," he challenges preachers, young and old alike, to develop a type of scholarly, Biblically based address that will "tax our brains to put it enlighteningly . . . and drain our lives to set it forth movingly." In so doing, Coffin presents a gem of a book that deserves a careful reading.

CHARLES A. MCGLON,
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

READER IN PUBLIC OPINION AND COMMUNICATION. Edited by Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz. (Revised edition). Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1953; pp. xi+612. $5.50.

This volume is a collection of many of the more noteworthy articles and studies in the formation and control of public opinion, theories of public opinion and communication, the results of measurements of public opinion, and the methods of measurement used in these areas. The time covered extends from an article on the evaluation of public opinion by George Carslake Thompson written in 1886, to summaries on communications research by Paul S. Lazarsfeld in 1949.

Much of value to speech teachers is contained in this volume. Perhaps of particular interest are the articles by Hadley Cantril which compare the effects of propaganda in the two world wars; the article by Harold D. Laswell on the symbols of identification; the article by Daniel Katz on knowledge, conviction, and significance as criteria of communication; public opinion and the legislative process by Frank V. Cartwell; human interest stories and democracy by Helen M. Hughes; motion picture and youth by W. W. Charters; the four articles on morals, democracy, and freedom in relation to the communication arts and industries; and a revision of Walter Lippmann's treatment of stereotypes.

Several of the authors present their definitions of communication. For example, Charles H. Cooley says: "by communication is meant the mechanism through which human relations exist and develop all of the symbols of the mind, together with the means of conveying them through space and preserving them in time"; Robert Park says that "communication maintains the concert necessary to enable our groups to function together"; John Dewey is quoted: "society not only continues to exist by transmission, by communication, but may fairly be said to exist in transmission, in communication"; Carl I. Hovland defines communication as the "process by which an individual (the communicator) transmits stimuli to modify the behavior of other individuals (communicatees)"; and Robert C. Angell: "merely the passing of ideas from one mind to another. The receiving mind may not accept the ideas, and even the originating mind may not believe them."

Robert K. Merton asks: "Does the unelaborated appeal to sentiment (of our mass media) which displaces the information pertinent to assessing this sentiment blunt the critical capacities of listeners?" Many other pertinent questions of concern to speech teachers are asked.

The reviewer is disappointed that practically no consideration of the importance of speech is given. The importance of both speech and communication in interpersonal communication is not treated. The reviewer suggests that the failure thus far to formulate an overall theory of communication represented in this and similar books comes from the inattention to the functions and importance of speech in our culture.

ELWOOD MURRAY,
University of Denver.

N. R. B. PUBLIC SPEAKING MANUAL. Compiled by the Editoral Staff of the National Research Bureau, Inc., Chicago: The National Research Bureau, Inc., 1953; pp. 237, 8½" by 11". $17.95.

For $17.95 you can get this five-pound, eight-ounce manual in a "beautiful," gold stamped, simulated leather, loose-leaf binder. It is "not a book or a course, but rather a 'how-to' guide for every speaking occasion . . . an entirely new approach . . . completely different from anything that has ever been done before."

If you are a speech teacher who has taught with one or more of the many excellent public speaking texts now available and if you must spend eighteen dollars from your own budget to examine this volume, the chances of your uncovering any new idea or miracle approaches to justify your expenditure are remote indeed. If you have been a student in a class where an enthusiastic and inspirational instructor guided you through the basic steps of speech preparation and delivery, rigorously and repeatedly, then this volume has little to offer you. But the *NRB Public Speaking Manual* was not prepared for speech teachers or those who have had the opportunities of an effective speech course. It is intended for the business man who desperately seeks the trade secrets, the special gimmicks, so that he may suddenly charm and influence audiences in a manner commensurate with his five-digit income.

The unrestrained salesmanship of the introduction, as well as the assertions that this manual reveals revolutionary principles, will distress most members of the SAA. For example:

> Have you ever had that dream of so captivating an audience that you could hear a pin drop . . . or of making them roar with laughter . . . or of selling your ideas so strongly that you're smothered with thunderous applause?
>
> Already, the manual has been called the most helpful ever written on the subject of public speaking.

In spite of obvious and significant criticisms, this manual can be of considerable help to the busy individual whose maximum effort to improve himself will consist of using a quick reference document. The twenty-eight check lists pose questions which a prospective speaker can most profitably consider at various stages in his preparation. The table of contents states the basic principles of a fundamentals of speech text in popularized phrases which attract attention and impel one to seek out the

explanatory material. The actual content is thorough and sound.

If you know someone interested in practical, brief suggestions on speech making, brought together in quick reference form, and if he is the sort of person who will react favorably to beautiful binding, high pressure salesmanship in an introduction, and a $17.95 price tag—the chances are excellent that the *Public Speaking Manual* of the National Research Bureau will please and help him.

EARNEST BRANDENBURG,
Washington University

BRIEFLY NOTED

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES: 1952-1953. Edited by A. Craig Baird. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1953; pp. 199. $1.75.

A small volume is inadequate to encompass the extraordinary amount of speechmaking in 1952, but Professor Baird has made a valuable collection for today and tomorrow. Speeches associated with the campaign are featured prominently, but those on Foreign Relations, National Ideals, Domestic Economic Policies, Intellectual Ideals, and Ethical and Religious Ideals are incorporated too. Addresses from Dulles, Bradley, Lodge, Eisenhower, Barkley, Stevenson, Nixon, Truman, and others are included. Little criticism can be made of the editor's selections, but it is tempting to inquire why three from Eisenhower found a place in the volume at the expense of others which were necessarily omitted.

DALLAS C. DICKEY,
University of Florida

IT TAKES TIME: AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION. By Marie I. Rasey. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953; pp. 204. $3.00.

A moving description of the evolution of a deep philosophy of life growing out of devotion and industry on life work well chosen and appreciated is the outstanding merit of this book.

In addition, it furnishes a brief and interesting overview of changes in educational theory and practice in the last fifty years. Subject-matter-centered teaching, knowledge and skill, the whole child, individual worth, etc. are clarified by means of personal episodes.

GLADYS L. BORCHERS,
University of Wisconsin

YOUR VOICE AND SPEECH. By Letitia Raubicheck. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953; pp. 376. $4.05.

This is a complete revision of the former *Voice and Speech Problems*. It is interesting reading, well suited to the secondary school level.

The division of the book into parts seems to be in its favor, since individual class characteristics can be met by the different parts as needed. Including "Voice Production" as Part VI may be questioned by some. The introduction of the phonetic approach is in keeping with some philosophies of articulation. However, the author continues to stress the New England pattern of speech as the basis of pronunciation. In many respects, this edition represents a new textbook in the field.

G. BRADFORD BARBER,
Illinois State Normal University

HOW TO BE A SUCCESSFUL EMCEE. By LeRoy Stahl. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison and Co., 1953; pp. 200. $2.75.

The role of the master of ceremonies should, perhaps, be glorified by this detailed, twelve chapter treatment.

Although good items occur among the reams of advice, the total effect is superficiality. Many recommendations are obvious and others contestable. The composition frequently is "corn," characterized by the use of *Fudnuk* as a general utility term.

This book could be useful to a neophyte facing an assignment. Mr. Stahl's "successful emcee," however, bears little resemblance to the *QJS*'s "good man speaking well."

ROBERT HAAKENSON,
Temple University

GROUPS IN HARMONY AND TENSION. By Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953; pp. 316. $3.50.

This work focuses some hypotheses of the thinking of Social Psychology as regards problems within groups and between groups. It is well organized, uses research material excellently, and makes a contribution to our understanding of the problems of communicating to people as individuals and as members of groups. It emphasizes the need to utilize research in order to understand group development and effective communication.

NATHAN KOHN, JR.,
Washington University

EFFECTIVE READING. By Lawrence H. Feigenbaun. New York: Globe Book Company, 1953; pp. 214. $2.00.

This remedial reading text provides practical help for students at the secondary level whose reading is below par. About fifty short selections afford practice in reading to learn; about twenty focus on reading newspapers, directions, maps, directories, and letters; and another twenty focus on vocabulary; graded tests and word games give added interest. All in all, this should be a particularly helpful aid in correcting reading deficiencies.

JAMES I. BROWN,
University of Minnesota

READING SKILLS. By William D. Baker. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953; pp. 120. $1.50.

This book of twenty-four thousand-word selections is designed to help college students improve their reading skills. Both basic and general reading skills are treated, including attention to the reading of literature. Objective comprehension check questions and application exercises are provided for each selection.

In addition to its obvious usefulness in reading laboratories and clinics, the book should afford English teachers an invaluable supplement to the usual collection of readings, since it provides students with specific practical techniques to apply in all kinds of reading.

JAMES I. BROWN,
University of Minnesota

WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY. Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Co., 1953; pp. xxxvi+1724. $5.00 plain edges, $6.00 thumb-indexed.

This new desk dictionary for college students has two good features. First, the listing of all 142,000 entries in alphabetical order is a convenience to the student, though it may be a headache to the publishers when they bring out a revised edition. Second the editors have used the IPA schwa [ə] and the [ŋ], and they indicate a syllabic consonant by substituting an apostrophe ['] for the omitted vowel.

DON STREETER,
Memphis State College

THE ROMANCE OF THE ENGLISH THEATRE. By Donald Brook. (Revised Edition). London: Rockliff (Macmillan), 1953; pp. 222. $4.50.

This compact little volume contains more than one hundred excellent photographs and illustrations which ought to delight devotees of the theatre. However, the current paper shortage in England forced the author (much to his regret and mine) to compress into two hundred pages what had been planned for five hundred. The result is a survey of the bare facts of the principal theatre companies, actor-managers, producers, and writers of the English theatre from its early Elizabethan beginnings to the present.

Chapter X through XIV will be of interest to students of the modern English theatre. An epilogue which concludes the book points to the buoyant optimism of Christopher Fry as perhaps indicative of the dawn of a second Elizabethan Age.

THOMAS D. PAWLEY,
Lincoln University (Missouri)

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN PLAYS, FROM 1767 TO THE PRESENT. Edited by Arthur Hobson Quinn. (Seventh Edition). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953; pp. 1248. $6.50.

People who are familiar with the sixth edition of this standard work will find nothing new here except Haines' *Command Decision* and the Hammerstein-Rodgers-Logan-Michener *South Pacific*. Any who are not familiar with this work will find in it an invaluable collection of many otherwise unobtainable American plays which, as the title of the book suggests, are representative of the history of the American theatre.

HAROLD CRAIN,
State University of Iowa

APPROACHES TO POETRY. By Walter Blair and W. K. Chandler. (Second Edition). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953; pp. 734. $3.90.

A substantial revision of the first edition of *Approaches To Poetry* should be helpful to the serious student who approaches the study of poetry with the hope that he will be able to understand and to appreciate. The authors classify without pigeon-holing and clarify without dictating.

One may be disappointed in the number of "chestnuts" included and in the scarcity of modern selections; but for the beginner, the anthology is quite suitable.

L. H. MOUAT,
San Jose State College

POEMS FOR STUDY. By Leonard Unger and William Van O'Connor. New York: Rinehart, 1953; pp. xxi+743. $4.75.

This English text for undergraduates could be put to good use by any student of interpretative reading. It offers a good selection of British and American verse from 1500 to the present, but not so many poems that they have to be crammed into the volume. Scholarly and critical analysis is provided where needed and omitted when it would be repetitive. The principles of analysis are clearly presented, and could be applied by the oral reader to his study and preparation of many selections not in this volume.

JOSEPH BALDWIN,
University of Mississippi

THE BURLESQUE TRADITION IN THE ENGLISH THEATRE AFTER 1660. By V. C. Clinton-Baddeley. London: Methuen & Co., 1952; pp. xvi+152. $4.00.

The high points of English theatrical burlesque, from Buckingham and Fielding, through Sheridan's *Critic* and the extravaganzas of Gilbert, to the modern Christmas pantomime and the literary triumphs of Stephen Leacock and Max Beerbohm, are sketched in lightly. True burlesque is here defined as poking loving fun at a general absurdity, as distinct from the harsh attack of satire and the particularity of parody.

GEORGE R. KERNODLE,
University of Arkansas

THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES. Revised from Peter Roget by D. C. Browning. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1953; pp. 572. $3.75.

Every worker with words has *Roget's Thesaurus* in one form or another on his shelves. (One can buy it in the corner drug store.) And everyone who has Roget himself will want this edition by D. C. Browning, who has overhauled the entire work so as to bring all the words and phrases into accordance with current usage. He has removed some which are out-of-date and added over 10,000 more, including a full representation of technical terms of today, everyday neologisms, slang, and Americanisms; at the same time, he has preserved Roget's original plan of classification and categories.

One feature of this revision is the enlarged index. This book includes 744 columns of index as against 608 somewhat shorter columns in the last Everyman edition. And the process of hunting the required word has been further simplified by the insertion of numerous cross-references in those cases where one paragraph is closely related to others.

LIONEL CROCKER,
Denison University

BOOKS RECEIVED

EXPERIMENT IN THE TEACHING OF COMMUNICATION TO THE STUDENTS OF THE LABOR EDUCATION DIVISION. By Bess Sondel. Chicago: Roosevelt College, 1953; pp. 34. Not for sale. Single copies available upon request. (Speech teachers working with adult groups in their communities will be particularly interested in this report by Dr. Sondel of the University of Chicago concerning activities with a class in communication which she conducted for Roosevelt College.)

ELEMENTS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY. By L. Larry Leonard. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1953; pp. xvi+611. $6.00. ("A dynamic new approach to foreign policy, this text abandons the outdated treatment of foreign policy as contemporary diplomatic history of wars, treaties, and diplomatic correspondence. Instead, the approach is a positive consideration of foreign policy as a reaction of the whole sensitized system of the nation to foreign stimuli, each reaction being dictated by a complexity of domestic factors.")

THE DUCHESS OF MALFI. By John Webster. Edited by Fred B. Millett. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. (*Crofts Classics*), 1953; pp. xii+108. $.35.

PURGATORY. By Dante Alighieri. Translated and edited by Thomas B. Bergin. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. (*Crofts Classics*), 1953; pp. vi+114. $.35.

RIGHT AND WRONG THINKING AND THEIR RESULTS. By Aaron Martin Crane. (Revised Edition). New York: Exposition Press, 1953; pp. viii+360. $3.00. ("*Right and Wrong Thinking and Their Results* is a self-help book that has been tried and found valuable through twenty-three editions. It analyzes the use of man's most precious tool, his mind.")

THE MEANING OF THE GLORIOUS KORAN. An explanatory translation by Mohammed Marmaduke Pickthall. New York: A Mentor Book, New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1953; pp. xxix+464. $.50. ("The aim . . . is to present to English readers what Muslims the world over hold to be the meaning of the words of the Koran. . . .")

IN THE PERIODICALS

Laura Crowell, *Editor*

Inasmuch as the American regional and professional journals in the field doubtless come regularly to the attention of members of the profession, this department will limit its reference to periodicals not officially or directly concerned with speech. Readers are therefore referred to the current issues of American Speech, The Central States Speech Journal, The Southern Speech Journal, The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, Educational Theatre Journal, Speech Monographs, *and* Western Speech.

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

LAURA CROWELL
University of Washington

AUSTON, JOHN T., "Methods and Levels of Measurement in Speech," *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* XIII (Summer 1953), 228-247.

"A discussion of problems related to conceptualizing new structures for educational research, with the hope that research in speech testing can proceed in orderly fashion."

BASKERVILLE, BARNET, "I Teach Speech," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin,* XXXIX (Spring 1953), 58-69.

An excellent refutation of the wide-spread misconceptions about the teaching of public speaking, and an explanation of modern stress upon communication of worthwhile content.

CAFFREY, JOHN, " 'Auding' as a Research Problem," *California Journal of Educational Research,* IV (September 1953), 155-161.

Suggesting 38 questions which badly need investigation on "auding," defined as hearing, listening, and comprehending "as one total experience."

CHAMPNEY, FREEMAN, "Liberty and Communication," *The Antioch Review,* XIII (Fall 1953), 303-312.

Only effective communication will establish an atmosphere in which civil liberties can exist. General principles of communication in a democracy are suggested here.

DORSON, RICHARD M., "Southern Negro Storytellers in Michigan," *Michigan History,* XXXVII (June 1953), 197-204.

A month spent in small Negro communities in Michigan revealed expert Negro storytellers.

ELLINGSWORTH, HUBER W., "John Peter Altgeld as a Public Speaker," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society,* XLVI (Summer 1953), 171-177.

Overcoming obstacles of physique, voice, and brief formal education, Altgeld was effective through vigorous use of illustration, logical arrangement, and careful preparation.

LEVENSTEIN, AARON, "The Demagogue and the Intellectual," *The Antioch Review,* XIII (Fall 1953), 259-274.

A forceful discussion of the errors in logic—half-truth, undistributed middle, extension of meaning, faulty sorites—which are being used in public hearings today.

PETERSON, OWEN M., "Ethelbert Barksdale in the Democratic National Convention of 1860," *The Journal of Mississippi History,* XIV (October 1952), 257-278.

Editor Barksdale became a political speaker of state and national importance; his "sincere, forceful and convincing argument, based on sound evidence and reasoning," won respect.

POULTON, E. C., "Two-Channel Listening," *Journal of Experimental Psychology,* XLVI (August 1953), 91-96.

Reporting a study of the selection of occasional bits of relevant information during prolonged listening to two simultaneous verbal sources.

REDFIELD, ROBERT, "Does America Need a Hearing Aid?" *Saturday Review,* XXXVI (September 26, 1953), 11-12, 43-45.

A good explanation of the two-way process of communication, with the suggestion that America cease talking steadily to other nations and listen to them.

RICE, GEORGE P., JR., "Civil Liberty Challenges Rhetoric and Public Speaking," *The Educational Forum,* XVII (May 1953), 473-481.

The writer gives four basic reasons urging that a "unit dealing with speech as a civil liberty . . . be added to the basic course in public speaking."

SOMERVELL, D. C., "The Qualities of a Great Prime Minister," *Parliamentary Affairs*, VI (Summer 1953), 242-249.

A vivid analysis of the greatest national leaders of Britain as to their maintenance of the seven difficult relationships required of a prime minister.

SOULBURY, THE LORD, "Ancient and Modern Oratory," *The Quarterly Review*, CCXCI (July 1953), 285-300.

A brief estimate of the great figures of Greek, Roman, and British oratory, and a recommendation that modern lawyers and statesmen could learn clearness, precision, and brevity from the classic models.

WILLIAMS, T. HARRY, "Abraham Lincoln: Principle and Pragmatism in Politics," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XL (June 1953), 89-106.

Suggesting the more accurate evaluation of Lincoln as a democratic and spiritual leader made possible through the publication of the nine volumes of the *Collected Works*.

WOODY, ROBERT H., "The Inexhaustible Lincoln," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, LII (October 1953), 587-610.

A discussion of several of the many Lincoln books, including the *Collected Works*, and biographies by Thomas, Randall, and Horner.

DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

WESLEY WIKSELL
Louisiana State University

BRADFORD, LELAND P., and JACK R. GIBB, "Developments in Group Behavior in Adult Education," *Review of Educational Research*, XXIII (June 1953), 233-247.

A review of research trends in dynamics of large and small groups, in group leadership, and in human-relations training. Bibliography.

BROWN, WILLIAM H., "An Instrument for Studying Viscidity within Small Groups," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, XIII (Autumn 1953), 402-417.

Reporting the construction of an inventory giving an index to the viscidity of the group, and also five partial scores indicating attitudes within the group.

GERARD, HAROLD B., "The Effect of Different Dimensions of Disagreement on the Communication Process in Small Groups," *Human Relations*, VI (No. 3, 1953), 249-271.

Studies at the University of Michigan show the importance of division into majority and minority groups, and differences in homogeneous and heterogeneous groupings.

GOLDFARB, WALTER, "Principles of Group Psychotherapy," *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, VII (July 1953), 418-432.

A study of psychiatrically conducted group therapy, divided into two sections: the group structure (its effects on the individuals); the therapeutic tools.

GROSS, NEAL, WILLIAM E. MARTIN, and JOHN G. DARLEY, "Studies of Group Behavior: Leadership Structures in Small Organized Groups," *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLVIII (July 1953), 429-432.

A study of leadership in thirteen small organized living groups shows the effects of different leadership structures on group functioning.

HEINICKE, CHRISTOPH, and ROBERT F. BALES, "Developmental Trends in the Structure of Small Groups," *Sociometry*, XVI (February 1953), 7-38.

Differences occur in developmental trends, in satisfaction with the group and its solution, and in efficiency between groups initially high in status-consensus and groups initially low.

HERTZ, DAVID B., and ALBERT H. RUBENSTEIN, "Communications in Research," *Industrial Laboratories*, IV (July 1953), 53-56.

Giving the kinds of information necessary for members of a research team in solving problems in groups effectively.

HOWELL, WILLIAM S., "Is Forensic Experience Valuable After College?" *The Gavel*, XXXV (May 1953), 85-86.

Nine years after participation the former students considered forensics to be the "most beneficial extracurricular activitity available to the college student."

MAIER, NORMAN R. F., "An Experimental Test of the Effect of Training on Discussion Leadership," *Human Relations*, VI (No. 2, 1953), 161-173.

A study of eighty groups showing clearly that the resistance of a group to change can be markedly reduced if the leader is given eight hours of training on discussion procedures.

MILLS, THEODORE M., "Power Relations in Three-Person Groups," *American Sociological Review*, XVIII (August 1953), 351-357.

Three-person groups tend to break up into a pair and another person, and the coalition gains strength through the common object of opposition.

PIGORS, PAUL, "Communication in Industry: A Cure of Conflict?" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, VI (July 1953), 497-506.

Communication as such will not always reduce conflicts; it can make a bad situation worse and a good one better.

ROSEBOROUGH, MARY E., "Experimental Studies of Small Groups," *Psychological Bulletin*, L (July 1953), 275-303.

A valuable review of studies in behavior of groups and individuals, and of culture, social structure, situational and personality variables. Good bibliography.

SHEARS, L. W., "The Dynamics of Leadership in Adolescent School Groups," *The British Journal of Psychology*, XLIV (August 1953), 232-242.

Reporting a study of the emergence of leaders in two experimental groups.

SUTHERLAND, ROBERT L., "Your Are the Key to Better Human Relations," *Journal of Home Economics*, XLV (September 1953), 466-468.

Group discussion is one of the ways to better personal relations.

THEODORSON, GEORGE A., "Elements in the Progressive Development of Small Groups," *Social Forces*, XXXI (May 1953), 311-320.

A study of the on-going social process during fifteen weeks of meeting, describing the evolutionary changes emerging from the group interaction.

ZELKO, HAROLD P., "Company Policy for Better Communications," *The Journal of Industrial Training*, VII (March-April 1953), 19-23.

Day-by-day, personal contacts are more effective than printed communications.

RADIO AND TELEVISION

GLENN STARLIN
University of Oregon

BARNES, MELVIN W., "Thousands Study Creative Crafts Through Television," *The Nation's Schools*, LII (July 1953), 86, 88, 90.

Outlines the method and success of the Creative Crafts TV program series of the Oklahoma City Public Schools.

BRETZ, RUDY, "Televising a Symphony Orchestra," *Journal of the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers*, LX (May 1953), 559-571.

Description of production methods worked out in the televising of the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra with limited facilities and rehearsal time.

CLARK, WILLIAM, "The Future of Television," *Twentieth Century*, CLIV (July 1953), 48-52.

A consideration of whether commercial television should be permitted to operate in Great Britain in competition with BBC.

EMERY, DONALD J., "College Courses by Television," *College and University Business*, XIV (June 1953), 26-29.

The experience of Western Reserve University, the University of Omaha, Butler University, and the University of Toledo in credit courses by television.

ENNES, HAROLD E., "The Dage Industrial TV Camera," *Radio and Television News*, L (July 1953), 31-34, 125-127.

A technical description of how the Dage TV Camera is built and how it can be used.

FEINGOLD, WILLIAM R., "Color TV," *Radio and Television News*, L (October 1953), 51-53, 173.

The author reviews the status of color television and predicts what to expect in color television receivers.

HEATH, ERIC, "How To Sell Television Scripts," *Author and Journalist*, XXXVIII (October 1953), 21-26.

Suggestions on methods of contacting and presenting scripts to buyers, and a list of markets.

HOWARD, JACK, "Hollywood and Television—Year of Decision," *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television*, VII (Summer 1953), 359-369.

An examination of Theatre TV and Subscription TV, with attention to results on both media and on the public interest.

LERNER, MAX K., "Limitations Imposed on Television and Radio: A Problem That Needs Immediate Attention," *American Bar Association Journal*, XXXIX (July 1953), 568-571, 574-575.

An argument favoring permission to broadcast court and legislative proceedings.

MANVELL, ROGER, "A Head Start in Television," *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television*, VII (Spring 1953), 246-252.

This British critic and lecturer discusses the potential of television and the motion picture.

MOLYNEUX, WILLIAM, "Less Than Meets the Eye," *Theatre Arts*, XXXVII (August 1953), 69-72.

A professional TV designer discusses the planning necessary and some of the techniques used in designing scenery for television.

O'HARA, HARUKO, "Comparative Preferences of Radio and Television Programs," *Sociology and Social Research*, XXXVII (May-June 1953), 305-311.

Summary of a questionnaire study which attempts to measure the effects of television on preferences of radio programs.

OLDEN, GEORGE, "Graphic Arts in TV," *Design*, LIV (June 1953), 217, 224.

A brief article outlining graphic art jobs and techniques of the artist in television.

RIDENOUR, LOUIS N., and GEORGE W. BROWN, "Fundamental Problems of Subscription Television: the Logical Organization of the Telemeter System," *Journal of the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers*, LXI (August 1953), 183-194.

Problems of encoding and decoding a TV picture, operating requirements, and the logical organization of subscription systems are outlined in detail.

SELDES, GILBERT, "Radio, TV and the Common Man," *Saturday Review*, XXXVI (August 29, 1953), 11-12, 39-41.

Broadcasters should give the public "every opportunity to find its own level of taste by having access to the best as well as to the mean. . . ."

DRAMA

ALBERT E. JOHNSON
University of Texas

BARKER, GEORGE, "William Shakespeare and the Horse with Wings," *Partisan Review*, XX (July-August 1953), 410-420.

Barker discusses the effect Shakespeare's poetry has upon him and concludes that at bottom poetry is an acceptance of life.

BRYANT, JOSEPH ALLEN, JR., "The Function of *Ludus Coventriae*," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, LII (July 1953), 340-345.

An explanation of how "The Trial of Joseph and Mary," one of the coarsest of comedies, came to be included in the decorous and dignified *Ludus Coventriae*.

CLINTON-BADDELEY, V. C., "Elizabethan Players in Sherborne," *Theatre Notebook*, VII (July-September 1953), 83.

Sherborne, in Dorset, contains a building that has hardly been altered since it was built in the sixteenth century. Its Long Room was used by Elizabethan actors.

CUNY, THERESE M., "Drama Festivals," *Players*, XXIX (April 1953), 153.

The author summarizes some of the outstanding benefits derived from a well-organized, well-executed festival.

DECKER, CLARENCE R., "Ibsen in England," *American-Scandinavian Review*, XLI (June 1953), 147-152.

A review of Ibsen's reception in England and the storm of controversy he aroused in 1889, 1891, 1893, and 1896.

GOLDEN, JOSEPH, "Draw a Magic Circle," *Players*, XXIX (May 1953), 176-177.

An experiment at the Tufts Summer Arena Theatre proved that "the exclusive use of young actors is perhaps the truest form of children's theatre."

HAVIGHURST, WALTER, "Custer's Last Stand—in Madison Square Garden," *Colorado Quarterly*, II (Summer 1953), 95-107.

An interesting resumé of Steele McKaye's staging of Buffalo Bill's Wild West show.

KRUTCH, JOSEPH WOOD, "The Not-So-Good Old Days," *Theatre Arts*, XXXVII (October 1953), 78-80, 93.

Surveying the theatre of his early youth, Krutch does not yearn for it and believes that about the beginning of World War I the general level of drama rose.

MERCIA, O.S.F., Sister M., "Girls Can Be Boys," *Dramatics*, XXIV (May 1953), 8, 31.

Through training in posture and "thinking" like a man, a good actress "can create the illusion of masculinity in spite of the obvious physical handicaps."

NAGLER, A. M., "The Furttenbach Theatre in Ulm," *Theatre Annual*, XI (1953), 45-65.

A scholarly and much-needed account, accompanied by nine plates, of the work of Furttenbach, "architect, engineer, mechanician,

pyrotechnist, and writer on these and allied subjects."

RULE, JOHN T., "Movies and TV: Murder or Merger?" *Atlantic*, CXCII (October 1953), 55-58.

"The motion picture industry has within itself the capacity to survive. . . . If it needs a savior, that savior is much more likely to be television than either 3-D or wide screen or both."

VALENCY, MAURICE, "Little Theatre, Come Blow Your Horn," *Theatre Arts*, XXXVII (October 1953), 68-69, 92-93.

"A wealth of available contemporary drama lies over the ocean, declares a successful adapter of foreign plays."

INTERPRETATIVE READING

WILLIAM B. MCCOARD
University of Southern California

ASHTON, J. W., "Literature and the English Language Arts," *College English*, XIV (November 1952), 92-93.

The ghost of "literature as a leisure-time activity" can be laid if the teacher knows both life and literature well.

DEARING, BRUCE, "Experiments with Audio-Visual Aids in Teaching Poetry," *College English*, XIII (March 1952), 322-324.

Comment on the use of a library of poetic recordings and a magnetic recorder, both inside and outside the classroom.

GILLIS, EVERETT A., "Definition in Contemporary Poetry," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, LII (July 1953), 349-354.

Aid in discovering the structure of modern poetry, its method and its goal, which is to reorganize an unstable and changing universe into a more ordered world.

HEWES, HENRY, "The Backward Town of Llareggub," *Saturday Review*, XXXVI (June 6, 1953), 24-25.

Dylan Thomas is assisted by five actors in the reading of his new play, "Under Milk Wood," a reading piece which surpasses poetry in allowing him "to represent lived-around subjects."

HOFFMAN, CHARLES G., "The Shorter Fiction of Herman Melville," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, LII (July 1953), 414-430.

A report of the high artistic values in the shorter fiction of this increasingly important writer.

HOPWOOD, V. G., "The Interpretation of Dream and Poetry," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, XXI (January 1952), 128-139.

The social nature of poetry puts limits on its interpretation by the methods of psychoanalysis.

HOSKINS, KATHERINE, "A Field of Vision," *New Republic*, CXXVI (June 16, 1952), 19-20.

The immense variety to be found among writers of contemporary poetry can be challenging, satisfying, stimulating.

JARRELL, RANDALL, "The Age of Criticism," *Partisan Review*, XIX (March-April 1952), 185-201.

A reasonable criticism of criticism. We should be less concerned by what others say than by what we find for ourselves.

LINTON, CALVIN O., "Introducing the Sophomore to His Imagination," *College English*, XIII (April 1952), 388-392.

Literature is no "fun" until the student can enter through his own imaginative processes.

MCKEAN, RICHARD, "Semantics, Science, and Poetry," *Modern Philology*, XLIX (February 1952), 145-159.

Poetry has practical, scientific, and aesthetic aspects. All three approaches are subject to distortions and misuses—which are the bases of the discussion.

O'CONNOR, WILLIAM VAN, "The Wilderness Theme in Faulkner's 'The Bear,'" *Accent*, XIII (Winter 1953), 12-20. Also MOSES, W. R., "Where History Crosses Myth; Another Reading of 'The Bear,'" *Accent*, XIII (Winter 1953), 21-33.

Insight into the Nobel prize winner's purposes and techniques.

WELSH, PAUL, "Interpreting Literature," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, LI (January 1952), 85-92.

A helpful summary of the various approaches that might be applied to gain an understanding. The conclusion: sensitivity is conveyed by contagion rather than precept.

WEST, RAY B., JR., "Three Methods of Modern Fiction," *College English*, XII (January 1951), 193-203.

An examination of three stories by Hemingway, Mann, and Welty, respectively, to throw light on the nature of technique and its

significance for the reading of modern literature.

YOSHIDA, MINORU, "Word-Music in English Poetry," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, XI (December 1952), 151-159.

An examination of "certain types of repetition in sound-tint which appear in the writings of English and American poets."

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS

BERT EMSLEY
Ohio State University

BLANSHARD, BRAND, "Philosophical Style," *The Yale Review*, XLII (Summer 1953), 547-578.

Illustrated largely from writers who have style whether they admit it or not, this article advocates simplicity, concreteness, gusto, *and* thought.

BOLINGER, DWIGHT L., "The Life and Death of Words," *The American Scholar*, XXII (Summer 1953), 323-335.

In line with the revolution exemplified by Malkiel and the neo-Humboldtians: "words evolve in masses of forms and meanings with infinite cross- and counter-influences, like soft bodies that crowd together and modify one another's shape and function."

BROWN, R. GRANT, and DANIEL JONES, "Broad Transcription," *le maître phonétique*, 3rd Series, No. 99 (January-June 1953), 16-19.

Brown's arguments against the length marks and replies by Jones, both in phonetically transcribed statements.

FAITHFULL, R. GLYNN, "The Concept of 'Living Language' in Cinquecento Vernacular History," *The Modern Language Review*, XLVII (July 1953), 278-292.

To the vernacular philologists of the Cinquecento "the vernacular *felt* alive . . . because they shared it with living people."

"Language Study and American Education," *Publication of the Modern Language Association*, LXVIII (September 1953), 56-61.

The American Council of Learned Societies seeks to encourage research and instruction in foreign and native languages through applied linguistics.

LEES, ROBERT R., "The Basis of Glottochronology," *Language*, XXIX (April-June 1953), 113-127.

The number of years during which languages with established cognates have diverged from one another (as German and English) can be determined with reasonably small error.

LEVETTE, J. DAVIDSON, "Colorado Place-Name Studies," *Western Folklore*, XII (July 1953), 204-208.

The literature of Colorado place-names is extensively surveyed here.

MCDAVID, RAVEN I., "Three Reviews," *Studies in Linguistics*, XI (March-June 1953), 35-45.

Pei's *Story of English*, Partridge and Clark's *British and American English since 1900*, and Baum's *Other Harmony of Prose* are given a critical overhauling by an exacting linguist.

TRIM, JOHN L. M., "Some Suggestions for the Phonetic Notation of Sounds in Defective Speech," *Speech*, XVII (April 1953), 21-24.

For indicating deviations other than dialectal IPA modifiers are proposed: for example, eighteen different representations for various forms of sigmatism.

WALKER, JERELL R., "The Sign Language of the Plains Indians of North America," *The Chronicles of Oklahoma*, XXXI (Summer 1953), 168-177.

Material from many published sources shows that the sign language was well adapted to the cultural pattern of these tribes, especially to their methods of warfare.

"Word Puzzles," *Theosophy*, XLI (August 1953), 452-457.

The terms *uplift* and *altruism* are dangerous when too verbal, hyperidealistic, or hypocritical, within the framework of "manvantaric evolution."

SPEECH SCIENCE

LORETTA WAGNER SMITH
Brooklyn College

ANASTASI, ANNE, and FERNANDO A. CORDOVA, "Some Effects of Bilingualism upon the Intelligence of Puerto Rican Children in New York City," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XLIV (January 1953), 1-19.

Generally low intelligence test scores are attributed, in part, to maladjustments arising "from the children's severe language handicap during their initial school experiences."

BERNREUTER, ROBERT G., "Implications of Recent Studies on Intelligence," *Transactions of*

the New York Academy of Sciences, XV (June 1953), 301-305.

Describes recent studies in intelligence and emphasizes Spearman's challenge to "build a test which would measure the separate abilities at each age."

CATTELL, RAYMOND B., and WALTER GRUEN, "The Personality Factor Structure of Eleven Year Old Children in Terms of Behavior Rating Data," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, IX (July 1953), 256-266.

A study of modifications of personality factor structure (using thirty variables) in 173 boys and girls who were peer-rated.

COX, F. N., "Sociometric Status and Individual Adjustment Before and After Play Therapy," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLVIII (July 1953), 354-356.

An investigation into the nature of interpersonal relationships at an Australian orphanage; Moreno's sociometric questionnaire yielded valid and reliable results.

ENGSTROM, HANS, and JAN WERSALL, "Is There a Special Nutritive Cellular System Around the Hair Cells in the Organ of Corti?" *Annals of Otology, Rhinology and Laryngology*, LXII (June 1953), 507-512.

A discussion of these minute filiform processes as to their possible importance in the nutrition of the hair cells.

HILDING, A. C., "Studies of the Otic Labyrinth," *Annals of Otology, Rhinology and Laryngology, LXII* (June 1953), 462-476.

Part IV deals with the deviation of the visual axes after vestibular stimulation; Part V with the possible relation of the insertion of the tectorial membrane to acoustic trauma.

KILLE, ELEANOR C., "Therapy and Training Programs for Middle Grade, Epileptic, Physically Handicapped and Emotionally Disturbed Older Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LVIII (July 1953), 88-92.

Emphasizes that success for these individuals depends on a highly specialized and carefully planned program administered by well-trained personnel.

KOCK, W. E., and R. L. MILLER, "Dynamic Spectograms of Speech," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XXIV (November 1952), 783-784.

Describes a dynamic spectograph useful in portraying the rapid changes in the spectrum content of sounds.

KOLB, LAWRENCE C., "Clinical Evaluation of Prefrontal Lobotomy," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, CLII (July 18, 1953), 1085-1089.

Fifteen years of experience indicates effectiveness particularly in "relieving destructive drives, chronic depression, hypochondriasis, impulsiveness, and overactivity."

LIEBER, FRITZ, "Spotlight into the Brain," *Science Digest*, XXXIV (October 1953), 44-47.

A popular discussion of the toposcope which "samples electrical conditions in more than 20 areas of the brain and then reproduces them in the changing glow of electronic tubes . . ."

MADONICK, M. J., and J. M. STEIN, "A Case of Amnesic Aphasia of Fifteen Years' Duration: Disturbances in Abstract Thinking," *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases*, CXVII (March 1953), 251-261.

A case of persistent amnesic aphasia supports the conclusion that there is not only "difficulty in naming but also a disturbance in abstract thinking."

MARTIN, ROBERT V., "An Analysis of the Needs for the Cerebral Palsied in a Representative Suburban County and a Plan for Their Management," *New York State Journal of Medicine*, LII (September 1952), 2154-56.

Discusses objectives, types of cases, personnel, and research in the cerebral palsy center which the author directs.

SCHLANGER, BERNARD B., "Speech Measurements of Institutionalized Mentally Handicapped Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LVIII (July 1953), 114-122.

Of the seventy-four children studied the scores correlated more highly with the M.A. than with the C.A.

SMITH, MONCRIEFF, and EDNA A. WILSON, "A Model of the Auditory Threshold and its Application to the Problem of the Multiple Observer," *Psychological Monographs*, LXVII (No. 359, 1953), 1-35.

"Under the conditions of this experiment, the gain of the group over the individual was slight when false reports were equated."

STEVENS, K. N., S. KASOWSKI, and C. GUNNAR M. FANT, "An Electrical Analog of the Vocal Tract," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XXV (July 1953), 734-742.

Describes the design and construction of the analog and its application to linguistic and engineering research.

WHITESIDE, JAMES A., and RAY S. SNIDER, "Relation of Cerebellum to Upper Brain Stem," *Journal of Neurophysiology*, XVI (July 1953), 397-413.

Discusses the possible functional significance of a dual cerebellar projection and a "possible cerebellar role in the relay of various sensory modalities to the cerebrum."

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

WILLIAM W. FLETCHER
University of Minnesota

BATEMAN, G. H., "Oesophageal Speech after Laryngectomy," *Acta Otolaryngologica*, XLIII (April-June 1953), 133-139.

Coordinated graphic measurements of oesophageal pressure, thoracic and abdominal girth, and emitted sound are presented; theoretical considerations are included.

BOLIN, B. J., "Left-Handedness and Stuttering as Signs Diagnostic of Epileptics," *Journal of Mental Science*, XCIX (July 1953), 483-488.

A report of an institutional study revealing a significantly greater incidence of left-handedness and stuttering among epileptics than among other classes of mental hospital patients.

COOPER, HERBERT K., "Integration of Services in the Treatment of Cleft Lip and Cleft Palate," *Journal of the American Dental Association*, XLVII (July 1953), 653-659.

Emphasis is placed on the need for providing a variety of services for cleft palate persons so that optimal social rehabilitation may be accomplished.

EITINGER, L., "Aphonia," *Acta Psychiatrica et Neurologica Scandinavica*, XXVII (1953), 27-33.

The writer questions the tendency to classify functional aphonia as an hysterical symptom and reports cases as exceptions to such a classification.

FREUD, ESTI D., "Recent Trends in Aphasic Research," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, CX (September 1953), 186-193.

An attempt to correlate three different modern approaches to aphasia and to evolve an explanation of the physical bases.

FRICK, F. C., and W. H. SUMBY, "Control Tower Language," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XXIV (November 1952), 595-596.

Estimates the redundancy of Air Force control tower operators at ninety-six per cent, partially because of an unavoidably noisy setting and a low tolerance for error.

HOOPLE, GORDON D., and LOUIS M. DI CARLO, "The Formation of a Hearing and Speech Center," *Laryngoscope*, LXIII (August 1953), 721-731.

A brief presentation of prime requisites in physical facilities and personnel.

JELLINEK, AUGUSTA, "Observations on the Therapeutic Use of Spontaneous Imagery in Speech Therapy," *Folia Phoniatrica*, V (1953), 166-182.

Emotional conflicts basic to certain speech disorders are often revealed through analysis of forms and scenes that appear to the subject as he sits with closed eyes.

PAULS, MIRIAM D., and WILLIAM G. HARDY, "Hearing Impairment in Preschool-age Children," *Laryngoscope*, LXIII (June 1953), 534-540.

Thresholds of potential speech hearing for 572 very young children with communicative handicaps are summarized, and a discussion of training goals and approaches is presented.

PEARCE, ROBERT A. H., "Crossed Laterality: A Study of its Significance and Treatment in Ordinary School Life," *Archives of the Diseases of Childhood*, XXVIII (August 1953), 247-258.

A consideration of theoretical aspects of sidedness is followed by a report of an investigation of reversal symptoms among students in a China mission school.

PRUZANSKY, SAMUEL, "Description, Classification, and Analysis of Unoperated Clefts of the Lip and Palate," *American Journal of Orthodontics*, XXXIX (August 1953), 590-611.

A description of various types of clefts and a discussion of requisites for adequate speech and deglutition.

VAN DER VEER, GLADYS, "The Class for the Conservation of Hearing and Speech Correction," *Volta Review*, LV (September 1953), 355-356.

A brief description of the training program found in one public school system.

EQUIPMENT

WILLIAM J. TEMPLE, *Editor*

THE FIFTH AUDIO FAIR

The Audio Fair, a manufacturers' and dealers' exhibition of sound equipment held in conjunction with the annual meetings of the Audio Engineering Society, occupied four floors of the Hotel New Yorker this year. Exhibits ranged from the fatuous to the fabulous. A quick tour left a few outstanding impressions.

The Columbia "360," a table model automatic 3-speed phonograph of novel design which was described in this department some months ago, is now available in a luggage-type carrying case. Its weight is 26 lbs. The "360" has been followed to market by a number of similar machines by other manufacturers. There is even a kit for building your own to be had from the Heath Co., Benton Harbor 15, Mich. They have the new ceramic piezoelectric pickups, three-speed record changers, and at least two small loudspeakers. The Web-Cor Model 333 has three speakers and a GE magnetic pickup instead of the ceramic type. The new RCA Victor model in the same size and price range uses a single 8-inch Olson-designed speaker; its quality is amazingly good. The Motorola exhibit gave a direct comparison of the sound from a conventional portable phonograph and their new model.

Tape recorders in abundance were shown. The new RCA "pushbutton" home tape recorder seems very much like the one-motor, two-speed, two-track models of other manufacturers. The re-designed Crestwood was exhibited with its undoubtedly high-quality sound coming from a gigantic luxury-type loudspeaker system. A new low-priced line of tape machines was shown by Telectrosonic Corp., 35-18 37th St., Long Island City 1, N. Y. They have a 14-lb., portable, dual-track model with 3.75 inch-per-second tape speed at only $75, and another called the "Telectro-tape Secretary" at $115. They also showed an inexpensive tape player boxed with a Viewlex projector for recorded slide or filmstrip presentations. This machine cannot erase any part of the prerecorded lecture by mistake, because the tape player has no recording or erasing circuits.

The best guide to tape recorders is still the annual directory in the September issue of the *Audio Record*, mailed free on request by Audio Devices, Inc., 444 Madison Ave., New York 22.

CBS COLOR TV DEMONSTRATION

The Columbia Broadcasting System and its manufacturing, research, and programming subsidiaries demonstrated Columbia's all-electronic pickup, transmission, and reception of color television to invited representatives of the press at the Waldorf-Astoria on October 8th. The significance of the occasion was not in the quality of the off-the-air color, which did not seem to me to be as good as closed-circuit demonstrations I have seen, but in the news that was released about recent and near-future developments in color television.

Columbia's color TV camera uses only one image orthicon instead of the RCA camera's three. The difference in bulk and complexity was obvious at a glance. The CBS color receiving tube is also simpler, lighter, and less expensive than the RCA tube. The advantage of color over black and white is clear. As Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS and a psychologist by training (Ph.D., Ohio State, 1935), pointed out, color conveys more information. This fact is as important for education as for advertisement and entertainment.

Sustaining network programs are already being transmitted in color. They are being received in black and white on standard receivers. As soon as the Federal Communications Commission approves the standards for color TV proposed by a committee of the TV industry, segments of commercial programs will take on color. The CBS-TV transmitter in New York City is already fully equipped to transmit color signals. CBS-TV stations in Chicago and Los Angeles will be so equipped within a few months, and some 20 other affiliated stations have indicated that they are ordering the necessary equipment for color transmission.

Columbia can begin pilot production of color receivers in 30 days and line production in 120 days after FCC approval of the proposed color standards. Earliest Columbia color receivers with 15-inch tubes will retail at about

$1,000. Mass production will reduce the price by at least 40 per cent, probably by the end of 1955 or early in 1956. A 21-inch tube is being developed. We saw its rectangular front end.

RECORDINGS

ADLAI STEVENSON SPEAKS. *Edited and narrated by James Fleming. 12" LP. RCA Victor LM 1769.*

This record belongs on your shelf along with the Random House book, *Major Campaign Speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson, 1952.* Both will serve better than either alone to show how this man's use of rhetoric made him a figure of national consequence in a few short months. A study of the printed speeches can verify the analyses of the experts who wrote about their composition in the *QJS* last year, and the recording demonstrates the effectiveness of Stevenson's urbane and conversational delivery.

Mr. Fleming, who regards this record as an interim report, has chosen excerpts mostly from the more "philosophical" speeches of the campaign, but some of the lighter moments are included, too. The "egghead" passage, for example, from the speech at the University of Wisconsin, is used as a transition between two more serious discussions. Editorial comment is kept to a minimum and omitted entirely at the end of the record where it would have made an anticlimax.

The weakness of a record like this is that it contains only excerpts. Its usefulness for the student of public speaking is that the listener can go from the record to the printed text with the sounds fresh in his ears, with a fuller impression of the man and the occasion.

THROUGH CHILDHOOD TO THE THRONE. *12" LP. RCA Victor LM 1770.*

Produced by the Gramophone Company, Ltd., in collaboration with the British Broadcasting Corporation, this magnificent documentary includes moments from BBC broadcasts over a period of a quarter of a century. It tells the story of Elizabeth II from the announcement of her birth to her Christmas Day broadcast of 1952. The dignity and impeccable taste we have come to expect of the BBC are apparent throughout the record. The announcers and commentators identify the voices and the events but they do not display their own emotions or tell the listener what his feelings ought to be.

The voices of all the British monarchs from George V to Elizabeth II are here, with those of other members of the royal family, prime ministers (excepting Baldwin), Presidents of the United States, and other officials. The events include the first Christmas broadcast by George V in 1932, royal weddings and funerals, the Munich crisis in 1938, victory proclamations, royal visits to Canada, the United States and other countries, and many other formal and informal occasions. There is material in this record for students of phonetics, English dialects, radio, public address, and propaganda, and also for all of us who enjoy being reminded of stirring and sentimental occasions.

LOUIS MACNEICE *reading his own poetry, with commentary. 12" LP. Harvard Vocarium.*

My only acquaintance with this British poet and radio writer comes through this record. The poems he reads have been published in volumes called *Collected Poems, 1949,* and *Ten Burnt Offerings, 1952* (Faber & Faber, Ltd., London). The recordings were made at Harvard in May, 1953. I notice that Mr. MacNeice is scheduled to lecture and read at the Poetry Center in New York City next April in a series which includes the Sitwells, Joyce Cary, I. A. Richards, Truman Capote, W. H. Auden, Tennessee Williams, Dylan Thomas, Frederic Prokosch, and other well-known writers.

The poems are addressed to a somewhat sophisticated audience. Some of them make use of what Mr. MacNeice calls "casual feminine rhymes"—the teasing double and triple near-rhymes which are intended to frustrate and tickle the ear: "crazy-easy," "carriage-adage," "hector me-lecture me." Some include such unfamiliar words as *panache* and *farouche.* Some contain references to music and to Hindu mythology. Mr. MacNeice makes clear in his informal remarks that some of his poems are even more difficult than these to apprehend at first hearing.

The poet's manner in reading is casual, restrained, and somewhat monotonous. His comments on his poems are disarmingly candid, modest, and simple. What would we not give for this kind of record of some of the poems we studied in school and college?

THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING EARNEST, *starring Maurice Evans and Lucile Watson. 2 12" LP. Theatre Masterworks, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y. $11.90.*

The artificial, absurd, witty, and implausible characters of this Oscar Wilde play come most appropriately as disembodied voices from a loudspeaker. The best performances are those of Maurice Evans as John Worthing and Stella Andrews as Cecily, but none of them could be called poor except possibly in comparison with

some treasured (and distorted) memory of a performance in the theatre. Lady Bracknell is played by Lucile Watson with a vigor that contradicts her recent statement that she is tired and old and ready for retirement again. John Merivale is Algy, Leueen MacGrath is Gwendolen, Mildred Natwick is Miss Prism, and John Williams is Canon Chasuble. William Podmore plays the butler, and Robin Craven Algy's man-servant, Lane, who must be the prototype of Wodehouse's Jeeves with his "I do my best to give satisfaction, sir."

Margaret Webster directed the performance and supplied the explanatory "narration bridges" at the opening of each act which are delivered in character by Mr. Evans as Jack.

This is said to be the first full-length recording of this play. It will be interesting to compare it with the performance by John Gielgud, Edith Evans, Pamela Brown, and others which is to be released this winter by Angel Records.

AGNES MOOREHEAD *in "Sorry, Wrong Number," by Lucille Fletcher, edited, produced, and directed by William Spier. Decca Album No. DAU-2 (2 12" 78 rpm). Also available as a 10" LP. DL-6022.*

This thriller, so successful as radio drama that it has been broadcast over and over, is here presented on records for your listening pleasure, as the announcers say, and also for dissection and study. It is a gem of its kind.

The principal character, you may remember, is a whining, hysterical invalid, confined to her bed, who tries to call her husband by telephone at his office and by some accident finds herself cut in on a conversation between two men who have been hired to murder a woman later the same evening. She overhears details which convince her that she is to be the victim. (She deserves it). The rest of the playlet shows her successive unavailing attempts to forestall the end by telephoning for help, the suspense and horror heightened by failure after failure.

The plot machinery is a slander on the telephone company and its personnel, the police, and hospital employees, but the total effect is convincing because of Agnes Moorehead's brilliant performance.

AN EVENING WITH WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, *with an all star cast. Direction and narration by Margaret Webster. Album of 2 12" LP. Theatre Masterworks, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y. $11.90.*

For its second album (the first was "Hedda Gabler") Theatre Masterworks departed temporarily—for very good reasons—from its announced intention to make full-length recordings of classical plays. To support the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre this program, based on the original performance by the same cast at Hartford, Connecticut, on December 5, 1952, is offered to the general public. Profits from the sale of this album will go to the Festival Theatre Foundation, the non-profit organization sponsored by the state of Connecticut to provide a professional Shakespearean theatre, academy, and acting company for Summer festivals like those at Stratford-on-Avon and Stratford, Ontario.

This is an excellent recording (with one reservation) for classroom use. It includes scenes from *The Merchant of Venice, Henry V, Richard II, Twelfth Night,* and *Macbeth,* as well as other short selections. The recording is of high quality. Your students will recognize many of the voices as those of actors whom they respect for their competence and prominence in other fields of entertainment. Because of its variety this program is not too long for hearing at a single sitting, but it is too long for one classroom period of the ordinary length. My one complaint is that spotting individual scenes on the record is almost impossible because no blank spaces separate them.

The list of names of stars in this performance speaks for itself. In alphabetical order they are Wesley Addy, Staats Cotsworth, Richard Dyer-Bennett, Faye Emerson, Nina Foch, Eva Le Gallienne, Leueen MacGrath, Arnold Moss, Claude Rains, and Margaret Webster. In addition to playing small parts, Miss Webster introduces and explains the selections, and Mr. Dyer-Bennett sings "Fain Would I Wed," "O Mistress Mine," and "Come Away, Death." Copies of the printed program identifying all of the selections and containing brief sketches of the actors are obtainable at 25 cents each.

A SURVIVOR FROM WARSAW, OP. 46, *for speaker, male chorus and orchestra, by Arnold Schönberg. Hans Swarofsky conducting the Vienna Symphony Orchestra and Academic Chamber Chorus; Hans Jaray, narrator. Columbia ML 4664.*

The composer of "A Survivor from Warsaw" is the inventor of the revolutionary "twelve-tone system" of music, and his subject is a death march of a band of Jews from Warsaw. The text was written by the composer himself in English and scored for the speaker with exact indications of the rhythmic patterns and approximate directions for raising and lowering the pitch of the voice.

Conventions and Conferences

T. EARLE JOHNSON, *Editor*

CONVENTION CALENDAR

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA:

1953. New York City, December 28, 29, 30 at the Hotel Statler. Program Chairman: Karl Wallace, University of Illinois.

1954. Chicago, during the week of December 26 at the Conrad Hilton Hotel.

1955. Los Angeles, during the week of December 26 at the Hotel Statler.

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THEATRE ASSOCIATION:

1953. New York City, December 28-30, at the Hotel Statler. Program Chairman: Horace W. Robinson, University of Oregon.

1954. East Lansing, Michigan, in late August with Children's Theatre Conference at Michigan State College.

AMERICAN SPEECH AND HEARING ASSOCIATION:

1954. St. Louis, dates and convention hotel to be announced.

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH ASSOCIATION:

1954. Chicago, April 2-3, at the Hotel Sherman. Program Chairman: John Dietrich, University of Wisconsin.

1955. St. Louis, April 1-2, at the Hotel Jefferson.

PACIFIC SPEECH ASSOCIATION:

1953-54. Honolulu, December 5, University of Hawaii Campus.

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION:

1954. Dallas, Texas, March 29-April 3. Program Chairman: Charles Munro Getchell, University of Mississippi.

1955. Memphis, during first week in April. Program Chairman: Louise Davison, Atlanta.

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF THE EASTERN STATES:

1954. April 8-10, Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Program Chairman: David C. Phillips, University of Connecticut.

1955. March 31-April 2, Hotel Statler, New York City.

WESTERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION:

1954. Late November, time and place to be announced.

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

THE 1953 CONVENTION

Following is a summary of the program for the joint Speech Convention which will be held at the Statler Hotel in New York City on December 28, 29 and 30. (Some pre-convention committee meetings will take place on December 26 and 27.) We urge you to make your plans now to attend the convention. The Associations' officials have planned many worthwhile meetings in all phases of speech and dramatic art, and have provided ample time for members to attend the theatre and to visit radio and television stations, the UN and other points of interest. This promises to be one of our largest conventions. You will want to take advantage of the opportunity to meet with more than 2,000 of your colleagues and to participate in the program.

CONVENTION FEATURES

Stuart Chase has a prominent place in J. V. Garland's program dealing with social science and the field of speech. James Gordon Emerson will headline a section meeting devoted to rhetoric and the law. Reports on the theatre in Turkey, Japan, Latin America and Western Europe should prove of unusual interest to students of contemporary theatre. For the public school teacher, both elementary and secondary, there are a number of programs, with particular emphasis on reading aloud and on methods of testing and evaluation appropriate to the speech class. William H. Whyte, Jr., Associate Editor of *Fortune* magazine, whose writings on communication problems in industry have gained wide readership, will be a principal speaker. He will summarize an extensive program on business and industrial communication. E. C. Mabie will offer a program devoted to experimental aesthetics of the theatre. The nature and theory of communication are explored in meetings led by Seth Fessenden and John Keltner. New approaches to communication will be discussed by Norbert Wiener, author of *Cybernetics*, and E. L. Bernays, public relations counsel. The Reading Hour will feature

Joseph Auslander, Padraic and Mary M. Colum, and Mildred Dunnock.

Particular attention will be given to the ethical problems of communication in Burton Byers' panel on the preparation of teachers of communication, in Richard Murphy's program on ethical standards for the teacher of speech, in John Gassner's address "The Theatre in an Age of Science," and in Bower Aly's address "Speech in the Service of Tyranny and Freedom." Olin Downes, opera and music critic of the *New York Times*, will have a prominent role in the discussion of musical theatre. Research occupies a special place on a number of programs, with scholars and experimenters reporting their findings and discussing methodology.

On the annual forum, sponsored jointly by SAA and the NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials, will be heard the Honorable Karl E. Mundt, U. S. Senator from South Dakota; the Honorable Estes Kefauver, U. S. Senator from Tennessee; the Honorable Frederic R. Coudert, Representative in Congress from the 17th District of New York; and the Honorable Ed Gossett, formerly Representative in Congress from the 13th District of Texas. These men will discuss the question "How Should We Select the President of the United States?"

National leaders from the American Legion, the American Institute of Banking, Toastmasters International, Hearst Oratory, and Standard Oil will explain their training and contest programs. The Theatre Library Association and AETA will meet in joint session to discuss mutual problems concerning dramatic literature. The National Theatre Conference and AETA will also meet jointly for the first time to consider relationships between the community theatre and the educational theatre. The use of graphic aids to communication will be discussed by leading graphicists and audio-visual people on a program arranged by Colonel Eugene Myers, USAF. Barclay Leatham, Giraud Chester, and NSSC have planned eight sectional programs which explore many current problems of educational radio, television, and mass communications. Paul Carmack will guide a program which deals with the nature and standards of "probable proof" in debate. One of SAA's two general sessions is given over to problems mutual to SAA and the National Conference of Teachers of English. D. E. Morley and Gordon Peterson will present programs dealing with problems in speech correction, audiology, and hearing rehabilitation in the public schools. Criteria for evaluating debate will be drawn from five critiques of a "live" debate between Fordham and Notre Dame. The five judges will be John A. Ackley, E. C. Buehler, Dallas Dickey, Joseph F. O'Brien and Brooks Quimby. Carroll Arnold and Charles Redding will lead round table conferences on the measurement and evaluation of the results and methods of group discussion.

Languild Service

For the comfort and convenience of all convention-goers SAA and AETA have engaged the facilities of the Languild Convention Service, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. It will help members buy theatre tickets at minimum prices, secure transportation to and from New York, and arrange special tours. No service charge is made to members of the cooperating associations. Write *now*, stating your needs.

NUEA COMMITTEE

As heretofore, the NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation will hold its annual conference in conjunction with the SAA Convention in New York. The conference will open with an executive session of the Committee on December 27 and will be followed by a meeting of the representatives of member and affiliated leagues on December 28. At this meeting matters of policy will be considered; other meetings on December 28 and 29 will be open to any members of the Speech Association of America who wish to participate in advising the Committee concerning the choice of discussion and debate topics to be submitted to a national referendum of the high school leagues.

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH ASSOCIATION

The annual convention of the Central States Speech Association will meet in Chicago, on April 2 and 3, 1954, Hotel Sherman. The prediction is that attendance will surpass the 507 recorded a year ago.

Plans for the program are in charge of John Dietrich, University of Wisconsin, President of the Association for 1953-1954. Plans call for general meetings and for sectional meetings in speech and hearing, theatre, public address, secondary schools, communication, forensics, interpretation, radio and television, and graduate studies.

The American Speech and Hearing Association, The American Educational Theatre As-

sociation, and the American Forensic Association are planning the program in their respective areas.

Chairmen for the several program areas are John Irwin, University of Wisconsin; S. M. Marks, Purdue University; Glen Mills, Northwestern University; Lillian Wagner, Iowa State Teachers College; Max Fuller, Grinnell College; Leslie Davis, University of Oklahoma; Patricia McIlrath, University of Illinois at Urbana; Ed Willis, University of Michigan; and Winston Brembeck, University of Wisconsin.

Two special aims of the convention are to bring speech teachers of all specialized interests together and to provide a number of programs dealing strictly with problems of the classroom teacher.

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION

The twenty-fourth annual convention of the Southern Speech Association will be held at the Hotel Adolphus, Dallas, Texas, March 29-April 3, 1954. As has been its custom for many years, the Association will sponsor a forensics tournament and student congress for high school and college students of the Southern region in connection with its meeting.

Out of the underlying theme of the convention, "Speech—The Integrating Factor," will be developed three general sessions, a number of sectional programs, several organization meetings, breakfasts and luncheons, and banquets. Special attention will be given to the role of speech in business, to developments in radio-television, and to children's theatre. In addition the sectional meetings will concentrate on such areas as Fundamentals, Interpretation, Forensics, Rhetoric, Theatre, Speech and Hearing Disorders, Speech Education, including Speech Programs in the Elementary and Secondary Schools, Speech for Church Workers, and Graduate Research. Special attention will be given to the needs of elementary and high school teachers.

Practical application of research and theory will be stressed in the three workshops which are arranged by regional committees of the American Educational Theatre Association, the American Speech and Hearing Association, and the American Forensics Association. This year the theatre workshop will center on problems of arena staging. It and the speech correction workshop will be held on Saturday, April 3. The forensics workshop will be held in conjunction with the tournament, March 29-31.

A highlight of the convention will be the official visit of Karl Wallace, formerly Chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of Virginia, now Chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of Illinois and First Vice-President of the Speech Association of America. Professor Wallace will be the speaker at the convention banquet; his topic will be "The Field of Speech—1954."

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF THE EASTERN STATES

The forty-fifth annual convention of the Speech Association of the Eastern States will be held on April 8, 9, and 10, 1954, at the Penn-Sheraton Hotel in Philadelphia.

Tentative plans are under way to telecast one of the general sessions over a Philadelphia station. If the program is completed as planned, the members of the Association will view the program on receiving sets placed in the convention hotel ballroom.

In addition to two general sessions and the business meeting, eighteen sectional meetings will cover such topics as language arts in the elementary school, the high school speech program, public address, interpretation, radio and television, speech correction and hearing, and the theatre.

Some of the programs will include: Flora Rheta Schreiber of Adelphi as a panel leader discussing "The Battle Against Print," which concerns the struggle of sight and sound vs. printed material; William Hardy of Johns Hopkins Hospital presenting a lecture-discussion of some of the problems of audiology; Mrs. Zelda Horner Kosh of the Arlington, Virginia Public Schools discussing the problems of the public school teacher of speech; Dorothy Doob of Brooklyn College leading a discussion on cerebral palsy; Harry Weinstein of Temple University presiding over a panel on a phase of general semantics; Helen Hicks and a panel considering the theories of James-Lange, Gestalt, Adler, and others in a meeting entitled, "Interpretation as an Aid in Overcoming Personality Difficulties"; Miss Grace Stanistreet of Adelphi demonstrating work in Children's Theatre; Evelyn Konigsberg of the New York schools talking on the first speech course in high school; Albert Johnson demonstrating the work of the Speech and Hearing Centers in Pennsylvania; and Margaret McCausland of the Philadelphia school system speaking on some phase of speech correction and improvement. Other sections being planned concern public address, production of TV by schools and colleges on commercial stations, interpretation, and theatre.

NEWS AND NOTES

JANET BOLTON, *Editor*

IN CONCLAVE

LOUISIANA STATE WORKSHOPS. The Department of Speech of Louisiana State University sponsored in October a one-day workshop for teachers and students of interpretation and drama, and in November a conference on public speaking and debate. The drama program centered about the problems of the high school director; interpretation and public speaking meetings were concerned with evaluation of the performance of visiting high school students. In November, Louisiana speech teachers met in Lafayette for a conference in conjunction with the convention of the Louisiana Education Association.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI IMPROVEMENT OF SPEAKING AND WRITING CONFERENCE. A two-day October conference, "The Improvement of Speaking and Writing," at the University of Missouri was opened in general session by James H. McBurney of Northwestern University in an address, "Fact and Fancy in Teaching People How to Speak." Panels investigated the problems of teaching speaking and writing: individual needs of the student, including the exceptional student, motivation for learning, techniques of criticism, the teacher-student relationship, the uses of visual aids, and parliamentary procedure. Featured speakers were Robert M. White, editor, in an address entitled "The Tragedy of Stillborn Thought," and Donald Davidson of Vanderbilt University on "Grammar and Rhetoric: The Teacher's Problem."

IN THE CURRICULUM

FILMING IN PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE. This fall, films were made of each Dartmouth student in the beginning course, which concentrates on informative speaking.

SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION ARTS. The University of Denver has announced the organization of the *School of Communication Arts* in the College of Arts and Sciences. The school will offer degrees at the bachelor's, the master's, and the doctoral level in various combinations of study. The Director is Campton Bell.

SPEECH CORRECTION AREA AT GEORGIA. The University of Georgia has inaugurated a speech correction area under the joint sponsorship of the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education. The area will be responsible for developing a training curriculum, conducting research, and providing clinical and consultant services for the State and the Southeast. Stanley Ainsworth is chairman of the area, which is part of the program for the Education of Exceptional Children.

TV COURSES AT HOUSTON. The University of Houston opened the first Educational TV Station in May and received from the Emerson Radio Corporation a $10,000 prize for being the first such station in the world. This year, KUHT is presenting courses in agriculture, humanities, music appreciation, biology, and art. Non-credit courses and programs are offered for speech interest groups in the community.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH TELEVISION WORKSHOP. Under the direction of William S. Tacey, the University of Pittsburgh Department of Speech held a six-week television workshop during the summer session. Enrollment was limited to fifty, and a combination of lectures by guest speakers and afternoon production sessions was planned to prepare local educators and representatives of civic and business groups for the opening this fall of WQED, the educational TV station at Pittsburgh. The workshop continues this fall semester under the direction of Warren Dana, staff television director, WDTV.

QUEENS COLLEGE WORKSHOPS. Four laboratory workshops in acting, theatre production, debate, and discussion have been instituted at Queens College this year. The workshops are intended to encourage participation in the presentational aspects of the speech arts.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

APPOINTMENTS:

University of Alabama: C. Edwin Kemp, instructor in speech; Martha Bennett, Marjorie Esco, teaching assistants; Joan Reidy, assistant

to the debate coach; Harriet Willimon, audiometrist; Loretta Brown, Faye Cagle, Barbara Cox, Jean von Redlich, Helen Snell, clinicians; Bernard Dozier, technical assistant; Edwin Martin, theatre publicity and business manager.

University of Georgia: Stanley Ainsworth, professor of speech correction and chairman of the area.

University of Houston: George L. Arms, producer-director, KUHT; Lela E. Blount, acting chairman of the drama department; Tom Boyd, technical director; George L. Collins, art director, KUHT; Stanley K. Hamilton, assistant professor of drama; Dean Johnston, TV continuity writer; John Meaney, film director, KUHT; Paul Owen, producer-director, KUHT; Robert L. Scott, instructor in speech and director of debate; Lester Wolfson, assistant professor of English and speech.

University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division. Matthew Rigler, head of the Speech Clinic; Frank Dance, instructor in speech.

Iowa State College: Perry Patterson, Director, Iowa State College Theatre.

University of Minnesota: Wendell Josal, lecturer and technical director of the University Theatre.

University of Pittsburgh: Kenneth Edgar, instructor in speech; Aubrey Epstein, assistant professor of audiology; Lloyd Fuge, assistant director of men's debate; James M. McHale, assistant professor of speech; Lloyd Welden, Jr., instructor in speech and technical director of Pitt Players; Warren Dana, director of the Television Workshop.

Queens College: Norma Schneiderman, tutor in speech; Dorothy L. Klock, lecturer in radio and television; Harold Cooper, lecturer in radio and television; Edwin Cooperstein, lecturer in radio and television; Diane Derus, fellow in speech.

Syracuse University: Richard G. Roarabaugh, instructor in public address; Caryl M. Kline, instructor in public address; Gerald L. Leider, instructor in drama; Norman Ross, instructor in radio and television; Richard Dixon, Constance Fascia, Gilbert Herer, Edwin Ianondli, Elizabeth Molphy, graduate assistants.

University of Virginia: Helen L. Gunderson, assistant professor of speech and clinic supervisor in the speech and hearing center; Louis J. Frana, instructor in speech and associate director of the forensics program.

PROMOTIONS:

Louisiana State University: Francine Merritt, assistant professor of speech.

University of Minnesota: E. W. Ziebarth, dean of the Summer Sessions.

University of Missouri: Loren D. Reid, director of forensics; Thomas L. Fernandez, assistant director of forensics.

University of Pittsburgh: Leo G. Doerfler, professor of audiology and director of the Department of Audiology in the School of Medicine.

Syracuse University: Louis M. DiCarlo, professor of audiology and speech pathology; Eugene S. Foster, chairman of the Department of Radio and Television.

ON THE STAGES

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS 1955 NEW PLAY COMPETITION. The University Theatre (formerly the Illini Theatre Guild) at the University of Illinois in association with the 1955 Festival of Contemporary Arts has announced its third New Play Competition. The winning play will be produced by the theatre in March, 1955, as its major contribution to the 1955 Festival. Inquiries should be addressed to the Chairman of the New Play Committee, 10 Sixth Street Building, University of Illinois, Urbana.

JOHNS HOPKINS PLAYSHOP PROGRAM. In addition to the university theatre season at Johns Hopkins, the Playshop sponsors a series of lectures on theatre and dramatic literature. Claude Rains appeared in October in his "Words and Music," a special program event; Robert Penn Warren is scheduled for December; Carol K. Bang lectures on "Recent Scandinavian Drama" later in the month, and James McLaren on "The French Theatre Today" in April.

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI RING THEATRE NEW PLAY COMPETITION. The University of Miami has issued a preliminary announcement of a competition for original scripts for a play to be chosen for a première at the Ring Theatre. The play will be directed by Gordon Bennett in ten performances beginning May 12, 1954.

UNIVERSITY THEATRE: University of Houston: "Rip van Winkle" (original); *Amphitryon 38, The Shrike, Jonah, Merry Wives of Windsor.*

University of Illinois: Chicago Undergraduate Division: *The Parlor Story.*

Indiana University: *The Guardsman, The Happy Time, Twelfth Night,* "Abe Lincoln of

Pigeon Creek" (première), "The 1954 Jordan River Revue," *What Every Woman Knows.*

Iowa State College: *The Great Big Doorstep, Hedda Gabler, The Late Christopher Bean, The Barber of Seville, Cinderella.*

Johns Hopkins University: *Much Ado about Nothing, John Ferguson, The Blue Danube.* Children's Theatre: *Pinocchio, Little Red Riding Hood,* "Four and Twenty Blackbirds" (original), *The Silver Thread.*

Louisiana State University: *Lady from the Sea.*

University of Miami: *Hasty Heart, Best Foot Forward, Death of a Salesman, Ring Round the Moon, Merry Wives of Windsor,* and an original full-length play to be announced.

Queens College: *The Autumn Garden.*

San Jose State College: *Twelfth Night, The Winslow Boy, The Affairs of Anatol, Volpone, Hedda Gabler,* "Theban Trilogy."

Texas Christian University: *The Enchanted, The Millionairess, Charley's Aunt,* "Cup of Fury" (original).

IN THE STUDIOS

QUEENS RADIO AND TELEVISION. In May, as one of a series of four pilot programs produced by the city colleges of New York, the Queens College Speech and Hearing Center presented a half-hour program over Station WABD, Dumont. The program explained the work of the center by demonstrating five types of clinical cases. Response to the initial four programs has led the station to schedule a twenty-six week series of half-hour educational programs to be produced by the four colleges in conjunction with the NYC Board of Higher Education. Giraud Chester has been appointed chairman of the television coordinating committee of the city colleges and will work with the Dumont technical staff; Edward Greenberg will assist as coordinator for Queens College. Scheduled Queens programs will concern problems of college administration and community relations, modern music, the teaching of English to foreign students, and the cost of living.

THE REVIEWING STAND. On Sunday, October 18, The Reviewing Stand of Northwestern University conducted a special program to mark the beginning of its twentieth continuous year on the air. The anniversary program featured a talk by President J. Roscoe Miller of Northwestern University and selections by Northwestern's Chapel Choir. A panel of Northwestern educators, led by Dean J. H. McBurney, for ten years director and moderator of the program, explored the question, "What is the role of public discussion?" The members of the panel were Kenneth E. Olson, Dean of the Medill School of Journalism, Eldridge T. McSwain, Dean of the School of Education, and Irving J. Lee, Professor of Public Speaking.

FROM PLATFORM AND CONFERENCE TABLE

THIRD ANNUAL NATIONAL CONTEST IN PUBLIC DISCUSSION. The University of Illinois Chicago Undergraduate Division will again sponsor a national contest in public discussion by means of tape recordings. Information about the contest, which is now in its third year, may be obtained from Wayne Thompson, Head of the speech department.

Forensic plans for the semester include an intramural tournament and an invitational debate tournament at both the high school and the college level. Public programs, sponsored by the department, will be presented on campus and at the various Chicago Y.M.C.A.'s.

OXFORD DEBATERS ON AMERICAN COLLEGIATE PROPOSITION. The Oxford University debaters, on tour this fall, have accepted an invitation to participate in the Sixth Annual Cross-Examination Tournament at the University of Pittsburgh in December. The Britishers will debate the national collegiate topic in two regular rounds of the tournament against competing American schools.

IN MEMORIAM

Charles C. Fairchild, well-known to more than 6000 business men of Kansas City to whom he had taught public speaking, to successive generations of students at Manual High School, Kansas City, where he had taught since 1921, and to teachers of speech throughout Missouri and the Middle West, died last August following injuries in an automobile accident. Mr. Fairchild was a member and former deacon of the Country Club Congregational Church and a thirty-second degree Mason in the Scottish Rite. He held the A.B. and A.M. degrees, as well as a degree in law, from the University of Kansas. He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Ada Fairchild, and by three sons. A confidant and counsellor of civic and business leaders in Kansas City, he leaves a host of friends.

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH
INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIX

Adams, Philip Rhys, Samuel H. Goldenson, Clyde Kluckhohn, William G. Carr, and Arthur T. Vanderbilt. *Modern Education and Human Values.* Rev. by A. Craig Baird. 507.

Akin, Johnnye. Rev.: *Creative Dramatics for Children.* Frances Caldwell Durland. 375.

——— Rev.: *Notebook for Voice and Diction.* Lyle V. Mayer. 376.

——— Rev.: *Robert Browning.* J. M. Cohen. 248.

——— Rev.: *Stories to Dramatize.* Selected and edited by Winifred Ward. 244.

Allen, Charles L. *In Quest of God's Power.* Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 109.

Aly, Bower. Action in December. The Forum. 347.

——— A New Staff. The Forum. 499.

——— Freedom and Security. The Forum. 93.

——— Speech Buildings Today. The Forum. 220.

Anderson, Virgil A. A Modern View of Voice and Diction. 25.

——— Improving the Child's Speech. Rev. by Velma B. Hiser. 514.

Arndt, Elmer J. F. Rev.: *A House for Tomorrow and Other Sermons.* Reugen K. Youngdahl. 245.

——— Rev.: *Sunday Evening Sermons.* Ed. by Alton M. Motter. 245.

Arnold, Carroll C. Rev.: *The Written Word and Other Essays.* Hardin Craig. 509.

Ashworth, Bradford. *Notes on Scene Painting.* Rev. by Willard Bellman. 378.

Auer, J. Jeffery. Recent Literature in Discussion. New Books in Review. 95.

——— Rev.: *Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States: From George Washington, 1789, to Harry S. Truman, 1949.* 246.

Bacon, Wallace A. Scholarship and the Interpreter. 187.

Bahn, Eugene. A New Goethe Discovery: The Weilburger Goethe-Funde. 485.

Baird, A. Craig, ed by. *Representative American Speeches: 1952-1953.* Rev. by Dallas C. Dickey. 518.

——— Rev.: *Education for Freedom and Responsibility.* Edmund Ezra Day. 507.

——— Rev.: *Modern Education and Human Values.* Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Philip Rhys Adams, Samuel H. Goldenson, Clyde Kluckhohn, and William G. Carr. 507.

Baker, William D. *Reading Skills.* Rev. by James I. Brown. 519.

Baldwin, Joseph. Rev.: *Letters of Sherwood Anderson.* Ed. by Howard Mumford Jones. 372.

——— Rev.: *Poems for Study.* Leonard Unger and William Van O'Connor. 519.

Barber, G. Bradford. Rev.: *Speech Fundamentals.* Harry G. Barnes and Loretta Wagner Smith. 512.

——— Rev.: *Your Voice and Speech.* Letitia Raubicheck. 518.

Barber, Philip. *New Scene Technician's Handbook:* together with *Producing the Play* by John Gassner. (Rev. ed.). Rev. by Richard L. Scammon. 246.

Barnard, Raymond H., J. V. Garland, and Elwood Murray, in collaboration with Guthrie E. Janssen. *Integrative Speech.* Rev. by Wilbur E. Moore. 511.

Barnes, Harry G. and Loretta Wagner Smith. *Speech Fundamentals.* Rev. by George Bradford Barber. 512.

Barnes, Joseph. *Willkie: The Events He Was Part of—The Ideas He Fought for.* Rev. by Albert J. Croft. 104.

Barrett, Edward W. *Truth is Our Weapon.* Rev. by Giraud Chester. 506.

Baskerville, Barnet. The Place of Oratory in American Literature. 459.

Beasley, Jane. Rev.: *Stories and Games for Easy Lipreading Practice.* Rose V. Feilbach. 246.

Beaven, Winton H. Rev.: *The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg.* Ed. by Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr. 102.

Becker, Sam L. The Ordinal Position Effect. 217.

Beery, Althea and David H. Patton with the assistance of Martha Leeds and Ollie Backus. *Using Our Language.* Rev. by Mardel Ogilvie. 375.

Behl, William A. *Discussion and Debate.* Rev. by Harvey Cromwell. 366.

Bellman, Willard. Rev.: *Notes on Scene Painting.* Bradford Ashworth. 378.

——— Rev.: *The Technique of Stage Lighting.* (Rev. ed.). Rollo Gillespie Williams, F.I.E.S. 246.

Berelson, Bernard and Morris Janowitz, ed. by. *Reader in Public Opinion and Communication.* (Rev. ed.) Rev. by Elwood Murray. 516.

Biddle, William W. *The Cultivation of Community Leaders.* Rev. by Franklyn S. Haiman. 377.

Birch, Dorothy. *Training for the Stage.* Foreword by Donald Wolfit. Rev. by Lee Norvelle. 374.

Bird, Donald E. Rev.: *Common Errors in English and How to Avoid Them.* Alexander M. Witherspoon. 377.

——— Rev.: *Standard Handbook of Prepositions, Conjunctions, Relative Pronouns and Adverbs.* Compiled by the Funk and Wagnalls Editorial Staff. 246.

Black, John W. Rev.: *The Measurement of Hearing.* Ira J. Hirsh. 100.

Blair, Walter and W. K. Chandler. *Approaches to Poetry.* (Second ed.) Rev. by L. H. Mouat. 519.

Blocker, Simon. *The Secret of Pulpit Power.* Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 516.

Boardman, Gail. *Oral Communication of Literature.* Rev. by Margaret Robb. 101.

Boas, Frederick S. *An Introduction to Eighteenth Century Drama, 1700-1780.* Rev. by William G. B. Carson. 373.

Borchers, Gladys L. Rev.: *It Takes Time: An Autobiography of the Teaching Profession.* Marie I. Rasey. 518.

Bos, William H. Rev.: *John Wise: Early American Democrat.* George Allan Cook. 363.
Bowyer, John Wilson. *The Celebrated Mrs. Centlivre.* Rev. by George R. Kernodle. 247.
Braden, Waldo W. Rev.: *Logic, the Art of Defining and Reasoning.* John A. Oesterle. 111.
——— Rev.: *Persuasion: A Means of Social Control.* Winston Lamont Brembeck and William Smiley Howell. 99.
Brady, Elizabeth Hall, John T. Robinson, and Hilda Taba. *Intergroup Education in Public Schools.* Rev. by Franklyn S. Haiman. 241.
Brandenburg, Earnest. Rev.: *British Authors before 1800.* Ed. by Stanley J. Kunitz and Howard Haycraft. 378.
——— Rev.: *Champion Campaigner Franklin D. Roosevelt.* Harold F. Gosnell. 104.
——— Rev.: *N. R. B. Public Speaking Manual.* Compiled by the Editorial Staff of the National Research Bureau, Inc., Chicago. 517.
Brandenburg, Earnest and Philip A. Neal. Graphic Techniques for Evaluating Discussion and Conference Procedures. 201.
Brembeck, Winston Lamont and William Smiley Howell. *Persuasion: A Means of Social Control.* Rev. by Waldo W. Braden. 99.
Brigance, W. Norwood. Rev.: *Best Advice on How to Write.* Ed. by Gorham Munson. 246.
——— Rev.: *Education and the Nature of Man.* Earl C. Kelley and Marie I. Rasey. 105.
——— Rev.: *Great Books: Panacea or What?* Edward A. Fitzpatrick. 110.
Britton, Wayne L. Rev.: *Handbook of Writing and Speaking.* (Second ed.). Edwin C. Woolley, Franklin W. Scott, and J. C. Tressler. 246.
——— Rev.: *Public Speaking for the Professions and Clubs.* Samuel Kahn. 235.
Brook, Donald. *The Romance of the English Theatre.* (Rev. ed.) Rev. by Thomas D. Pawley. 519.
Brooks, Van Wyck. *The Writer in America.* Rev. by James J. Stansell. 377.
Brown, James I. Rev.: *Effective Reading.* Lawrence H. Feigenbaun. 519.
——— Rev.: *Reading Skills.* William D. Baker. 519.
Brown, John Russell. *On the Acting of Shakespeare's Plays.* 477.
Browning, D. C., revised from Peter Roget by. *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases.* Rev. by Lionel Crocker. 520.
Bryant, Donald C. New Light on Burke. The Forum. 351.
——— Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope. 401.
——— Rev.: *Die Kunst Der Politischen Rede In England.* Hildegard Gauger. 247.
——— Rev.: *People, Places, and Books.* Gilbert Highet. 377.
——— Rev.: *Samuel Johnson's Literary Criticism.* Jean H. Hagstrom. 236.
——— Rev.: *Taste and Criticism in the Eighteenth Century* (Life, Literature and Thought Library). Ed. by H. A. Needham. 236.
——— Rev.: *The Triumph of the English Language: A Survey of Opinions Concerning the Vernacular from the Introduction of Printing to the Restoration.* Richard Foster Jones. 369.
Bryant, Donald C. and Karl R. Wallace. *Fundamentals of Public Speaking.* (Second ed.). Rev. by C. Horton Talley. 376.
Bryson, Lyman. The Rhetoric of Conciliation. 437.
——— and George Kerry Smith. *Working for Democracy.* (Rev. ed.). Rev. by Gregg Phifer. 110.
Bunger, Anna M. *Speechreading—Jena Method.* (Rev. ed.). Rev. by Audrey A. Simmons. 378.
Burke, Kenneth. A Dramatistic View of the Origins of Language, Part III. 79.
——— Postscripts on the Negative. 209.
Burklund, Carl E. Melody in Verse. 57.
Bush, Douglas. *English Poetry: The Main Currents from Chaucer to the Present.* Rev. by Norman C. Stageberg. 248.
Butler, G. Paul, ed. by. *Best Sermons. 1951-1952 Edition.* Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 109.

Cable, W. Arthur. Rev.: *A Guide to Effective Public Speaking.* Lawrence Henry Mouat. 365.
Cardwell, Guy A. Rev.: *American Problems Today.* Robert Rienow. 377.
——— Rev.: *An Age of Criticism: 1900-1950.* William Van O'Connor. 107.
Carlile, Clark S. *Project Text for Public Speaking.* Rev. by A. E. Whitehead. 512.
——— Rev.: *How to Say a Few Words.* David Guy Powers. 368.
Carr, William G., Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Philip Rhys Adams, Samuel H. Goldenson, and Clyde Kluckhohn. *Modern Education and Human Values.* Rev. by A. Craig Baird. 507.
Carson, William G. B. Rev.: *An Introduction to Eighteenth Century Drama, 1700-1780.* Frederick S. Boas. 373.
——— Rev.: *Box, Pit, and Gallery: Stage and Society in Johnson's London.* James J. Lynch. 373.
Center, Allen H. and Scott M. Cutlip. *Effective Public Relations.* Rev. by C. W. Freed. 110.
Cerf, Bennett. *Good for a Laugh.* Rev. by Don Streeter. 111.
Chandler, W. K. and Walter Blair. Approaches to Poetry. (Second ed.) Rev. by L. H. Mouat. 519.
Cheney, Sheldon. *The Theatre: Three Thousand Years of Drama, Acting and Stagecraft.* Rev. by E. J. West. 243.
Chester, Giraud. Recent Books in Radio and Television. New Books in Review. 353.
——— Rev.: *A Televison Policy for Education.* Ed. by Carroll V. Newsom. 234.
——— Rev.: *Out of the Blue.* John Crosby. 101.
——— Rev.: *Truth is Our Weapon.* Edward W. Barrett. 506.
——— Rev.: *Vision in Television: The Origins and Potentialities of Educational Television.* Hazel Cooley. 234.
Chinoy, Helen Krich and Toby Cole, ed. by. *Directing the Play: A Source Book of Stagecraft.* Rev. by Harold Crain. 514.
Clinton-Baddeley, V. C. *The Burlesque Tradition in the English Theatre After 1660.* Rev. by George R. Kernodle. 520.

Coffin, Henry Sloane. *Communion through Preaching: The Monstrance of the Gospel.* Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 516.
Cohen, J. M. *Robert Browning.* Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 248.
Cole, Toby and Helen Krich Chinoy, ed. by. *Directing the Play: A Source Book of Stagecraft.* Rev. by Harold Crain. 514.
Constans, H. Philip and Claude E. Kantner. New Buildings for Old. 135.
Cook, George Allan. *John Wise: Early American Democrat.* Rev. by William H. Bos. 363.
Cooley, Hazel. *Vision in Television: The Origins and Potentialities of Educational Television.* Rev. by Giraud Chester. 234.
Corbett, E. A., Baldwin M. Woods, Helen V. Hammarberg, Cyril O. Houle, and S. E. Raybould. *Universities in Adult Education.* Rev. by David Potter. 247.
Corwin, Blanche A., ed. by. *The Theatre Annual, 1952,* Volume X. Rev. by Harry R. McClain. 244.
Cowles, Virginia. *Winston Churchill: The Era and the Man.* Rev. by Halbert E. Gulley. 509.
Coxe, M. S. and G. E. Peterson. The Vowels [e] and [o] in American Speech. 33.
Craig, Hardin. *The Written Word and Other Essays.* Rev. by Carrol C. Arnold. 509.
Crain, Harold. Rev.: *Directing the Play: A Source Book of Stagecraft.* Edited, with an Illustrated History of Directing, by Toby Cole and Helen Krich Chinoy. 514.
——— Rev.: *Play Direction.* John Dietrich. 514.
——— Rev.: *Representative American Plays: From 1767 to the Present.* (Seventh ed.) Edited by Arthur Hobson Quinn. 519.
Crocker, Lionel. Rev.: *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases.* Revised from Peter Roget by D. C. Browning. 520.
——— Truth through Personality. 1.
Croft, Albert J. Rev.: *Willkie: The Events He Was Part of—The Ideas He Fought for.* Joseph Barnes. 104.
Cromwell, Harvey. Rev.: *An Informal Guide to Public Speaking.* (Rev. ed.). William Freeman, ed. by Quincy Howe. 376.
——— Rev.: *Discussion and Debate.* William A. Behl. 366.
Crosby, John. *Out of the Blue.* Rev. by Giraud Chester. 101.
Crowell, Laura. Rev.: *Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Apprenticeship.* Frank Freidel. 240.
Curvin, Jonathan. Rev.: *The Faith of Our Fathers, an Anthology of Americana, 1790-1860.* Ed. by Irving Mark and Eugene L. Schwaab. 241.
Cutlip, Scott M. and Allen H. Center. *Effective Public Relations.* Rev. by C. W. Freed. 110.

Darley, Frederic, D. C. Spriestersbach, and Wendell Johnson. *Diagnostic Manual in Speech Correction.* Rev. by Charlotte G. Wells. 233.
Davee, Paul. Rev.: *Shakespeare's Histories at Stratford 1951.* J. Dover Wilson and T. C. Worsley. 242.
Davidson, Donald. Grammar and Rhetoric: The Teacher's Problem. 425.
Davison, Dennis, ed. by. *Andrew Marvell. Selected Poetry and Prose.* Rev. by L. H. Mouat. 247.
Day, Donald, ed. by. *Woodrow Wilson's Own Story.* Rev. by Clair R. Henderlider. 103.
Day, Edmund Ezra. *Education for Freedom and Responsibility.* Rev. by A. Craig Baird. 507.
Dean, Howard H. *Effective Communication: A Guide to Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening.* Rev. by Herold Lillywhite. 513.
de Banke, Cécile. *Shakespearean Stage Production: Then & Now. A Manual for the Scholar-Player.* Rev. by E. J. West. 515.
Dickey, Dallas C. Rev.: *Representative American Speeches: 1952-1953.* Edited by A. Craig Baird. 518.
——— Rev.: *The Words of Justice Brandeis.* Ed. by Solomon Goldman and with a Foreword by Justice William O. Douglas. 362.
Dieter, Otto A. Rev.: *Classics in Translation.* Ed. by Paul MacKendrick and Herbert M. Howe. Vol. I: Greek Literature; Vol. II: Latin Literature. 237.
——— Rev.: *Spinoza Dictionary.* Ed. with an Introduction by Dagobert D. Runes. 247.
——— Rev.: *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles.* Alexander Turyn. 236.
Dieth, Eugen and Harold Orton. *A Questionnaire for a Linguistic Atlas of England.* Rev. by Cameron W. Garbutt. 108.
Dietrich, John. *Play Direction.* Rev. by Harold Crain. 514.
Dilliard, Irving, collected with an introduction and notes by. *The Spirit of Liberty: Papers and Addresses of Learned Hand.* Rev. by Frederick W. Haberman. 237.
Doctor, Powrie Vaux. The Teaching of Speech to the Deaf. 488.
Drummond, A. M. and Richard Moody. Indian Treaties: The First American Dramas. 15.
Druten, John Van. Playwright at Work. Rev. by George R. Kernodle. 515.
Durland, Frances Caldwell. *Creative Dramatics for Children.* Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 375.

Eliot, Thomas H. *Basic Rules of Order.* Rev. by Sister Mary of the Cross, B.V.M. 242.
Emery, Walter B. The Current Status of Educational Television. 173.
Esar, Evan. *The Humor of Humor.* Rev. by Wesley Wiksell. 248.
Evatt, H. V., Foreword by. *Things Worth Fighting For.* Speeches by Joseph Benedict Chifley. Selected and Arranged by A. W. Stargardt. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 239.
Ewbank, Henry L., Jr. and William B. Hesseltine. Old Voices in the New South. 451.
Ewbank, Henry L. and Sherman P. Lawton. *Broadcasting: Radio and Television.* Rev. by Harrison B. Summers. 233.

Feigenbaun, Lawrence H. *Effective Reading.* Rev. by James I. Brown. 519.
Feilbach, Rose V. *Stories and Games for Easy Lipreading Practice.* Rev. by Jane Beasley. 246.
Fessenden, Seth A. Rev.: *Logic and Language.* (Second series). A. G. N. Flew. 371.
Fiedler, Miriam Forster. *Deaf Children in a Hearing World.* Rev. by S. Richard Silverman. 233.

Fitzpatrick, Edward A. *Great Books: Panacea or What?* Rev. by W. Norwood Brigance. 110.
Fletcher, Harvey. *Speech and Hearing in Communication.* Rev. by Ira J. Hirsh. 367.
Flew, A. G. N. *Logic and Language.* (Second series). Rev. by Seth A. Fessenden. 371.
Freed, C. W. Rev.: *Effective Public Relations.* Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center. 110.
Freeman, William, ed. by Quincy Howe. *An Informal Guide to Public Speaking.* (Rev. ed.). Rev. by Harvey Cromwell. 376.
Freidel, Frank. *Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Apprenticeship.* Rev. by Laura Crowell. 240.
Fuller, Max. Rev.: *Composing the Speech.* Glen E. Mills. 98.

Garbutt, Cameron W. Rev.: *A Questionnaire for a Linguistic Atlas of England.* Eugen Dieth and Harold Orton. 108.
——— Rev.: *Down in the Holler: A Gallery of Ozark Folk Speech.* Vance Randolph and George Wilson. 374.
Garland, J. V., Elwood Murray, and Raymond H. Barnard, in collaboration with Guthrie E. Janssen. *Integrative Speech.* Rev. by Wilbur E. Moore. 511.
Garvey, William David. The Intelligibility of Abbreviated Speech Patterns. 296.
Gassner, John, ed. with introduction by. *Best American Plays.* Third Series—1945-1951. Rev. by Evelyn Konigsberg. 107.
——— *Producing the Play;* together with the *New Scene Technician's Handbook* by Philip Barber. (Rev. ed.). Rev. by Richard L. Scammon. 246.
——— The Trifurcation of Drama and Theatre in English. 323.
Gauger, Hildegard. *Die Kunst Der Politischen Rede in England.* Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 247.
Gehring, Mary Louise. Rev.: *Jefferson Reader: A Treasury of Writings about Thomas Jefferson.* Ed. by Francis Coleman Rosenberger. 363.
Giffin, Kim. Rev.: *Parliamentary Law for the Layman.* Joseph F. O'Brien. 100.
——— Rev.: *Pocket Primer of Parliamentary Procedure.* (Fourth ed.). Fred G. Stevenson. 100.
Gilkinson, Howard and Lester Thonssen. *Basic Training in Speech.* (Second ed.). Rev. by Orville A. Hitchcock. 376.
Gokak, V. K. *The Poetic Approach to Language.* Rev. by L. H. Mouat. 370.
Goldenson, Samuel H., Clyde Kluckhohn, William G. Carr, Arthur T. Vanderbilt, and Philip Rhys Adams, *Modern Education and Human Values.* Rev. by A. Craig Baird. 507.
Goldman, Solomon, ed. by, and with a Foreword by Justice William O. Douglas. *The Words of Justice Brandeis.* Rev. by Dallas C. Dickey. 362.
Goldmark, Josephine. *Impatient Crusader.* Rev. by Orville Hitchcock. 508.
Gosnell, Harold F. *Champion Campaigner Franklin D. Roosevelt.* Rev. by Earnest Brandenburg. 104.
Grace, J. C. and W. J. Grace. *The Art of Communicating Ideas.* Rev. by Herold Lillywhite. 100.
Grace, W. J. and J. C. Grace. *The Art of Communicating Ideas.* Rev. by Herold Lillywhite. 100.
Granville, Wilfred. *The Theater Dictionary: British and American Terms in the Drama, Opera, and Ballet.* Rev. by E. J. West. 378.
Greet, W. Cabell. A Report on English in Europe. 465.
Griffin, Alice Venezky, ed. by. *Living Theatre.* Rev. by Lee Norvelle. 378.
Gruver, Bert. *The Stage Manager's Handbook.* Rev. by Lewis G. McFarland. 515.
Gulley, Halbert E. Rev.: *Winston Churchill: The Era and the Man.* Virginia Cowles. 509.
Gunderson, Robert G. Rev.: *A Documentary History of the United States.* Richard D. Heffner. 240
——— Rev.: *On Freedom's Altar: The Martyr Complex in the Abolition Movement.* Hazel Catherine Wolf. 362.

Haakenson, Robert. Rev.: *How to Be a Successful Emcee.* LeRoy Stahl. 518.
——— Rev.: *Radio and Television Communication.* Charles Frederick Lindsley. 234.
Haberman, Frederick W. Rev.: *The Spirit of Liberty: Papers and Addresses of Learned Hand.* Collected and with an introduction and notes by Irving Dilliard. 237.
Hagstrom, Jean H. *Samuel Johnson's Literary Criticism.* Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 236.
Haiman, Franklyn S. Concepts of Leadership. 317.
——— Rev.: *Intergroup Education in Public Schools.* Hilda Taba, Elizabeth Hall Brady, and John T. Robinson. 242.
——— Rev.: *The Art of Human Relations.* Henry Clay Lindgren. 364.
——— Rev.: *The Cultivation of Community Leaders.* William W. Biddle. 377.
Hall, Robert A., Jr. Don't Meddle Ignorantly with Your Language! 42.
Hall, Thomas S. Rev.: *General Education in School and College. A Committee Report.* 510.
Hammarberg, Helen V., Cyril O. Houle, S. E. Raybould, E. A. Corbett, and Baldwin M. Woods. *Universities in Adult Education.* Rev. by David Potter. 247.
Harbage, Alfred. *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions.* Rev. by Hubert C. Heffner. 371.
Harrity, Richard, prepared under the editorial supervision of. *Speeches of Adlai Stevenson.* Rev. by Wayne N. Thompson. 239.
Harter, D. Lincoln and John Sullivan. *Propaganda Handbook: A Guide to Mass Persuasion.* Rev. by Henry C. Youngerman. 363.
Haycraft, Howard and Stanley J. Kunitz, ed. by. *British Authors Before 1800.* Rev. by Earnest Brandenburg. 378.
Heffner, Hubert C. Rev.: *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions.* Alfred Harbage. 371.
Heffner, Richard D. *A Documentary History of the United States.* Rev. by Robert G. Gunderson. 240.
Henc rlider, Clair R. Rev.: *Woodrow Wilson's Own Story.* Ed. by Donald Day. 104.
Henstrom, Richard. Presidents of SAA. The Forum. 220.
Hesseltine, William B. and Henry L. Ewbank, Jr. Old Voices in the New South. 451.

Highet, Gilbert. *People, Places, and Books.* Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 377.
Hirsch, Ruth and C. M. Wise. Directions in Linguistics. New Books in Review. 225.
Hirsh, Ira J. Rev.: *Speech and Hearing in Communication.* Harvey Fletcher. 367.
——— *The Measurement of Hearing.* Rev. by John W. Black. 100.
Hiser, Velma B. Rev.: *Improving the Child's Speech.* Virgil A. Anderson. 514.
Hitchcock, Orville A. Rev.: *Basic Training in Speech.* (Second ed.). Lester Thonssen and Howard Gilkinson. 376.
——— Rev.: *Impatient Crusader.* Josephine Goldmark. 508.
Hoban, Charles F., Jr. and Edward B. Van Ormer, prepared by. *Instructional Film Research 1918-1950* (Rapid Mass Learning). Technical Report No. SDC 269-7-19. Rev. by Buell Whitehill, Jr. 244.
Holland, Virginia. Rhetorical Criticism: A Burkeian Method. 444.
Holmes, F. Lincoln D. Rev.: *Good American Speech* (Rev. ed.). Margaret McLean. 108.
——— Rev.: *Speech Improvement.* Letitia Raubicheck. 108.
Horner, Harlan Hoyt. *Lincoln and Greeley.* Rev. by Earl W. Wiley. 361.
Hotson, Leslie. *Shakespeare's Motley.* Rev. by William Ringler. 111.
Houle, Cyril O., S. E. Raybould, E. A. Corbett, Baldwin M. Woods, and Helen V. Hammarberg. *Universities in Adult Education.* Rev. by David Potter. 247.
Howe, Herbert M. and Paul MacKendrick, ed. by. *Classics in Translation.* Vol. I: Greek Literature; Vol. II: Latin Literature. Rev. by Otto A. Dieter. 237.
Howe, Quincy, ed. *An Informal Guide to Public Speaking.* (Rev. ed.). William Freeman. Rev. by Harvey Cromwell. 376.
Howell, William Smiley and Winston Lamont Brembeck. *Persuasion: A Means of Social Control.* Rev. by Waldo W. Braden. 99.
Hultzén, Lee S. Rev.: *The Story of English.* Mario Pei. 105.

Jackson, Elmore. *Meeting of Minds: A Way to Peace through Mediation.* Rev. by Gregg Phifer. 98.
James, Bessie R. and Mary Overstreet, ed. and comp. by. *Adlai's Almanac.* Rev. by Wayne N. Thompson. 239.
Janowitz, Morris and Bernard Berelson, ed. by. *Reader in Public Opinion and Communication.* (Rev. ed.) Rev. by Elwood Murray. 516.
Janssen, Guthrie E., in collaboration with Elwood Murray, Raymond H. Barnard, and J. V. Garland. *Integrative Speech.* Rev. by Wilbur E. Moore. 511.
Johnson, Wendell. Rev.: *Semantics and the Philosophy of Language: A Collection of Readings.* Ed. by Leonard Linsky. 231.
Johnson, Wendell, Frederic Darley, and D. C. Spriestersbach. *Diagnostic Manual in Speech Correction.* Rev. by Charlotte G. Wells. 233.
Jones, Howard Mumford, ed. by. *Letters of Sherwood Anderson.* Rev. by Joseph Baldwin. 372.
Jones, Richard Foster. *The Triumph of the English Language: A Survey of Opinions Concerning the Vernacular from the Introduction of Printing to the Restoration.* Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 369.

Kahn, Samuel. *Public Speaking for the Professions and Clubs.* Rev. by Wayne L. Britton. 235.
Kantner, Claude E. and H. Philip Constans. New Buildings for Old. 135.
Karr, Harrison M. *Developing Your Speaking Voice.* Rev. by Margaret Wood. 366.
Kaulhausen, Marie-Hed. Philological and Speech-Method Interpretation of Poetry. 340.
Kelley, Earl C. and Marie I. Rasey. *Education and the Nature of Man.* Rev. by W. Norwood Brigance. 105.
Kernodle, George R. Rev.: *The Celebrated Mrs. Centlivre.* John Wilson Bowyer. 247.
——— Rev.: *Playwright at Work.* John Van Druten. 515.
——— Rev.: *The Burlesque Tradition in the English Theatre After 1660.* V. C. Clinton-Baddeley. 520.
Kluckhohn, Clyde, William G. Carr, Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Philip Rhys Adams, and Samuel H. Goldenson. *Modern Education and Human Values.* Rev. by A. Craig Baird. 507.
Knower, Franklin H. and Thomas E. Richmond. An Analysis of Some Characteristics of Members of the Speech Association of America. 312.
Knower, Franklin H. and Twyla Jo Newhouse. Bachelor's Degree in Speech in America. 307.
Kohn, Nathan, Jr. Rev.: *Groups in Harmony and Tension.* Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif. 518.
Konigsberg, Evelyn. Rev.: *Best American Plays.* (Third Series—1945-1951). Ed. with Introduction by John Gassner. 107.
Kunitz, Stanley J. and Howard Haycraft, ed. by. *British Authors Before 1800.* Rev. by Earnest Brandenburg. 378.

Lawton, Sherman P. and Henry L. Ewbank. *Broadcasting: Radio and Television.* Rev. by Harrison B. Summers. 233.
Lee, Alfred McClung. *How to Understand Propaganda.* Rev. by Glen E. Mills. 109.
Lee, Irving J. Rev.: *The Universe of Meaning.* Samuel Reiss. 370.
Lennon, E. James. Mark Twain Abroad. 197.
Lillywhite, Herold. Rev.: *Effective Communication: A Guide to Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening.* Howard H. Dean. 513.
——— Rev.: *The Art of Communicating Ideas.* W. J. Grace and J. C. Grace. 101.
Lindgren, Henry Clay. *The Art of Human Relations.* Rev. by Franklyn S. Haiman. 364.
Lindsley, Charles Frederick. *Radio and Television Communication.* Rev. by Robert Haakenson. 234.
Linsky, Leonard, ed. by. *Semantics and the Philosophy of Language: A Collection of Readings.* Rev. by Wendell Johnson. 231.
Lomas, Charles W. The Lighter Side of the Literary Societies. 45.
Loper, Robert Bruce. Shakespeare "All of a Breath." 193.
Lorant, Stefan. *Lincoln—A Picture Story of His Life.* Rev. by Earl W. Wiley. 103.

Lynch, James J. *Box, Pit, and Gallery: Stage and Society in Johnson's London.* Rev. by William G. B. Carson. 373.

MacKendrick, Paul and Herbert M. Howe, ed. by. *Classics in Translation.* Vol. I: Greek Literature; Vol. II: Latin Literature. Rev. by Otto A. Dieter. 237.

Mark, Irving and Eugene L. Schwaab, ed. by. *The Faith of Our Fathers, an Anthology of Americana, 1790-1860.* Rev. by Jonathan Curvin. 241.

Marsh, Robert. Aristotle and the Modern Rhapsode. 491.

Marx, Milton. The Dominative-Defensive Conflict as the Basis of Dramatic Structure. 335.

Mary of the Cross, Sister, B.V.M. Rev.: *Basic Rules of Order.* Thomas H. Eliot. 242.

Mawhinney, Clara K. Rev.: *Practical Business Speaking.* (Third ed.). W. P. Sandford and W. H. Yeager. 110.

Mayer, Lyle V. *Notebook for Voice and Diction.* Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 376.

McBurney, James H. and Ernest J. Wrage. *The Art of Good Speech.* Rev. by J. M. O'Neill. 364.

McCall, Roy C. Harry Emerson Fosdick: Paragon and Paradox. 283.

McClain, Harry R. Rev.: *The Theatre Annual, 1952,* Volume X. Ed. by Blanche A. Corwin. 244.

McFarland, Lewis G. Rev.: *The Stage Manager's Handbook.* Bert Gruver. 515.

McGlon, Charles A. Rev.: *Best Sermons. 1951-1952 Edition.* Ed. by G. Paul Butler. 109.

——— Rev.: *Communion through Preaching: The Monstrance of the Gospel.* Henry Sloan Coffin. 516.

——— Rev.: *In Quest of God's Power.* Charles L. Allen. 109.

——— Rev.: *Stir up the Gift.* Paul S. Rees. 516.

——— Rev.: *The Secret of Pulpit Power.* Simon Blocker. 516.

McLean, Margaret. *Good American Speech.* (Rev. ed.). Rev. by F. Lincoln D. Holmes. 108.

Meerloo, Joost A. M. *Conversation and Communication.* Rev. by Cullen B. Owens. 106.

Menderson, Melanie F. *Parliamentary Procedure Simplified.* Rev. by Arleigh B. Williamson. 367.

Mills, Glen E. *Composing the Speech.* Rev. by Max Fuller. 98.

——— Rev.: *How to Understand Propaganda.* Alfred McClung Lee. 109.

Moody, Richard and A. M. Drummond. Indian Treaties: The First American Dramas. 15.

Moore, Wilbur E. Rev.: *Integrative Speech.* Elwood Murray, Raymond H. Barnard, and J. V. Garland, in collaboration with Guthrie E. Janssen. 511.

Moreno, J. L. *Who Shall Survive? Foundations of Sociometry, Group Psychotherapy, and Sociodrama.* Rev. by Elwood Murray. 368.

Motter, Alton M., ed. by. *Sunday Evening Sermons.* Rev. by Elmer J. F. Arndt. 245.

Mouat, Lawrence Henry. *A Guide to Effective Public Speaking.* Rev. by W. Arthur Cable. 365.

——— Rev.: *Andrew Marvell: Selected Poetry and Prose.* Ed. by Dennis Davison. 247.

——— Rev.: *Approaches to Poetry.* (Second ed.) Walter Blair and W. K. Chandler. 519.

——— Rev.: *The Poetic Approach to Language.* V. K. Gokak. 370.

Mulgrave, Dorothy I. *Speech for the Classroom Teacher.* (Rev. ed.). Rev. by Hugh F. Seabury. 110.

Munson, Gorham, ed. by. *Best Advice on How to Write.* Rev. by W. Norwood Brigance. 246.

Murphy, Richard. Rev.: *Major Campaign Speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson—1952.* 506.

——— and Howard Shuman. The Oxford Union: American View. 49.

Murray, Elwood. Rev.: *Reader in Public Opinion and Communication.* (Rev. ed.) Ed. by Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz. 516.

——— Rev.: *Who Shall Survive? Foundations of Sociometry, Group Psychotherapy, and Sociodrama.* J. L. Moreno. 368.

——— Raymond H. Barnard, and J. V. Garland, in collaboration with Guthrie E. Janssen. *Integrative Speech.* Rev. by Wilbur E. Moore. 511.

Neal, Philip A. and Earnest Brandenburg. Graphic Techniques for Evaluating Discussion and Conference Procedures. 201.

Needham, H. A., ed. *Taste and Criticism in the Eighteenth Century* (Life, Literature and Thought Library). Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 236.

Newhouse, Twyla Jo and Franklin H. Knower. Bachelor's Degree in Speech in America. 307.

Newsom, Carroll V., ed. by. *A Television Policy for Education.* Rev. by Giraud Chester. 234.

Norvelle, Lee. Rev.: *Training for the Stage.* Dorothy Birch. Foreword by Donald Wolfit. 374.

O'Brien, Joseph F. *Parliamentary Law for the Layman.* Rev. by Kim Giffin. 100.

O'Connor, William Van. *An Age of Criticism: 1900-1950.* Rev. by Guy A. Cardwell. 107.

——— and Leonard Unger. *Poems for Study.* Rev. by Joseph Baldwin. 519.

Oesterle, John A. *Logic, The Art of Defining and Reasoning.* Rev. by Waldo W. Braden. 111.

Ogilvie, Mardel. Rev.: *English Composition.* A. F. Scott. 378.

——— Rev.: *Using Our Language.* David H. Patton and Althea Beery with the assistance of Martha Leeds and Ollie Backus. 375.

Oliver, Robert T. Rev.: *Things Worth Fighting For.* Speeches by Joseph Benedict Chifley. Selected and arranged by A. W. Stargardt, with a Foreword by H. V. Evatt. 240.

——— *Verdict in Korea.* Rev. by E. W. Ziebarth. 238.

O'Neill, J. M. Rev.: *The Art of Good Speech.* James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage. 364.

Orton, Harold and Eugen Dieth. *A Questionnaire for a Linguistic Atlas of England.* Rev. by Cameron W. Garbutt. 108.

Overstreet, Mary and Bessie R. James, ed. and comp. by. *Adlai's Almanac.* Rev. by Wayne N. Thompson. 239.

Owens, Cullen B. Rev.: *Conversation and Communication.* Joost A. M. Meerloo. 106.

—— Rev.: *The Philosophy of Psychiatry*. Harold Palmer. 111.

Palmer, Harold. *The Philosophy of Psychiatry*. Rev. by Cullen B. Owens. 111.
Parker, Wyman W. Rutherford B. Hayes as a Student of Speech at Kenyon College. 291.
Parrish, W. M. Rev.: *Always the Young Strangers*. Carl Sandburg. 377.
—— Rev.: *A Reader's Guide to T. S. Eliot: A Poem-by-Poem Analysis*. George Williamson. 373.
Patton, David H. and Althea Beery with the assistance of Martha Leeds and Ollie Backus. *Using Our Language*. Rev. by Mardel Ogilvie. 375.
Pawley, Thomas D. Rev.: *The Romance of the English Theatre*. (Rev. ed.) Donald Brook. 519.
Pei, Mario. *The Story of English*. Rev. by Lee S. Hultzén. 105.
Peters, Edward. *Conciliation in Action: Principles and Techniques*. Rev. by Harold P. Zelko. 235.
Peterson, G. E. and M. S. Coxe. The Vowels [e] and [o] in American Speech. 33.
Phifer, Gregg. Rev.: *Meeting of Minds: A Way to Peace through Mediation*. Elmore Jackson. 98.
—— Rev.: *Working for Democracy*. (Rev. ed.). Lyman Bryson and George Kerry Smith. 110.
Philhour, Charles W. Rev.: *Stagecraft and Scene Design*. Herbert Philippi. 243.
Philippi, Herbert. *Stagecraft and Scene Design*. Rev. by Charles W. Philhour. 243.
Potter, David. Rev.: *Universities in Adult Education*. Cyril O. Houle, S. E. Raybould, E. A. Corbett, Baldwin M. Woods, and Helen V. Hammarberg. 247.
Powers, David Guy. *How to Say a Few Words*. Rev. by Clark S. Carlile. 368.

Quimby, Brooks. Speech in the Arts College. The Forum. 347.
Quinn, Arthur Hobson, ed. by. *Representative American Plays, From 1767 to the Present*. (Seventh ed.) Rev. by Harold Crain. 519.

Randolph, Vance and George Wilson. *Down in the Holler: A Gallery of Ozark Folk Speech*. Rev. by Cameron W. Garbutt. 374.
Rasey, Marie I. *It Takes Time: An Autobiography of the Teaching Profession*. Rev. by Gladys L. Borchers. 518.
—— and Earl C. Kelley. *Education and the Nature of Man*. Rev. by W. Norwood Brigance. 105.
Raubicheck, Letitia. *Speech Improvement*. Rev. by F. Lincoln D. Holmes. 108.
—— *Your Voice and Speech*. Rev. by G. Bradford Barber. 518.
Raybould, S. E., E. A. Corbett, Baldwin M. Woods, Helen V. Hammarberg, and Cyril O. Houle. *Universities in Adult Education*. Rev. by David Potter. 247.
Redfield, Robert. The Difficult Duty of Speech. 6.
Rees, Paul S. *Stir up the Gift*. Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 516.
Reid, Loren. Gladstone's Essay on Public Speaking. 265.
Reiss, Samuel. *The Universe of Meaning*. Rev. by Irving J. Lee. 370.
Rice, George P., Jr. Defamation by Slander. 75.
Richmond, Thomas E. and Franklin H. Knower. An Analysis of Some Characteristics of Members of the Speech Association of America. 312.
Rienow, Robert. *American Problems Today*. Rev. by Guy A. Cardwell. 377.
Ringler, William. Rev.: *Shakespeare's Motley*. Leslie Hotson. 111.
Robb, Margaret. Rev.: *Oral Communication of Literature*. Gail Boardman. 101.
—— Rev.: *Training the Voice for Speech*. (Rev. ed.). C. Raymond Van Dusen. 245.
Robinson, John T., Hilda Taba, and Elizabeth Hall Brady. *Intergroup Education in Public Schools*. Rev. by Franklyn S. Haiman. 241.
Robinson, Karl F. Rev.: *The Teacher of Teachers*. Harold Rugg. 368.
Rosenberger, Francis Coleman, ed. by. *Jefferson Reader: A Treasury of Writings about Thomas Jefferson*. Rev. by Mary Louise Gehring. 363.
Rugg, Harold. *The Teacher of Teachers*. Rev. by Karl F. Robinson. 368.
Runes, Dagobert D., ed. with an Introduction by. *Spinoza Dictionary*. Rev. by Otto A. Dieter. 247.

Sandburg, Carl. *Always the Young Strangers*. Rev. by W. M. Parrish. 377.
Sandford, W. P. and W. H. Yeager. *Practical Business Speaking*. (Third ed.). Rev. by Clara K. Mawhinney. 110.
Sansom, Clive. Australian Speech. 470.
Scammon, Richard L. Rev.: *Producing the Play*. John Gassner; together with the *New Scene Technician's Handbook* by Philip Barber. (Rev. ed.). 246.
Schachner, Nathan. *Alexander Hamilton: Nation Builder*. Rev. by Hollis L. White. 240.
Schwaab, Eugene L. and Irving Mark, ed. by. *The Faith of Our Fathers, an Anthology of Americana, 1790-1860*. Rev. by Jonathan Curvin. 241.
Scott, A. F. *English Composition*. Rev. by Mardel Ogilvie. 378.
Scott, Franklin W., J. C. Tressler, and Edwin C. Woolley. *Handbook of Writing and Speaking*. (Second ed.). Rev. by Wayne L. Britton. 246.
Seabury, Hugh F. Rev.: *Speech for the Classroom Teacher*. (Rev. ed.). Dorothy I. Mulgrave. 110.
Sherif, Carolyn W. and Muzafer Sherif. *Groups in Harmony and Tension*. Rev. by Nathan Kohn, Jr. 518.
Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn W. Sherif. *Groups in Harmony and Tension*. Rev. by Nathan Kohn, Jr. 518.
Shuman, Howard and Richard Murphy. The Oxford Union: American View. 49.
Silverman, S. Richard. Rev.: *Deaf Children in a Hearing World*. Miriam Forster Fiedler. 233.
Simmons, Audrey A. Rev.: *Speechreading—Jena Method*. (Rev. ed.). Anna M. Bunger. 378.
Smith, George Kerry and Lyman Bryson. *Working for Democracy*. (Rev. ed.). Rev. by Gregg Phifer. 110.

Smith, Loretta Wagner and Harry G. Barnes. *Speech Fundamentals.* Rev. by G. Bradford Barber. 512.
Sprague, Arthur Colby. *Shakespearian Players and Performances.* Rev. by E. J. West. 372.
Spriestersbach, Duane C. Rev.: *A Case Book in Speech Therapy.* Charles Van Riper. 513.
——— Wendell Johnson, and Frederic Darley. *Diagnostic Manual in Speech Correction.* Rev. by Charlotte G. Wells. 233.
Stageberg, Norman C. Rev.: *English Poetry: The Main Currents from Chaucer to the Present.* Douglas Bush. 248.
——— Rev.: *Who Killed Grammar?* Harry A. Warfel. 232.
Stahl, LeRoy. *How to Be a Successful Emcee.* Rev. by Robert Haakenson. 518.
Stansell, James J. Rev.: *The Writer in America.* Van Wyck Brooks. 377.
Stargardt, A. W., selected and arranged by. *Things Worth Fighting For.* Speeches by Joseph Benedict Chifley, with a Foreword by H. V. Evatt. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 239.
Stevenson, Fred G. *Pocket Primer of Parliamentary Procedure.* (Fourth ed.). Rev. by Kim Giffin. 100.
Streeter, Don. Rev.: *Good for a Laugh.* Bennett Cerf. 111.
——— Rev.: *Webster's New World Dictionary.* 519.
Stromer, Walter F. Defects of Discussion. The Forum. 349.
Sullivan, John and D. Lincoln Harter. *Propaganda Handbook: A Guide to Mass Persuasion.* Rev. by Henry C. Youngerman. 363.
Summers, Harrison B. Rev.: *Broadcasting: Radio and Television.* Henry L. Ewbank and Sherman P. Lawton. 233.

Taba, Hilda, Elizabeth Hall Brady, and John T. Robinson. *Intergroup Education in Public Schools.* Rev. by Franklyn S. Haiman. 241.
Talley, C. Horton. Rev.: *Fundamentals of Public Speaking.* (Second ed.). Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace. 376.
Thomas, Gordon L. Aaron Burr's Farewell Address. 273.
Thompson, Wayne N. Rev.: *Adlai's Almanac.* Ed. and compiled by Bessie R. James and Mary Overstreet. 239.
——— Rev.: *Speeches of Adlai Stevenson.* Prepared under the editorial supervision of Richard Harrity. 239.
Thonssen, Lester and Howard Gilkinson. *Basic Training in Speech.* (Second ed.). Rev. by Orville A. Hitchcock. 376.
Thonssen, Lester. Recent Literature in Rhetoric. New Books in Review. 501.
Tressler, J. C., Edwin C. Woolley, and Franklin W. Scott. *Handbook of Writing and Speaking.* (Second ed.). Rev. by Wayne L. Britton. 246.
Turyn, Alexander. *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles.* Rev. by Otto A. Dieter. 236.

Unger, Leonard and William Van O'Connor. *Poems for Study.* Rev. by Joseph Baldwin. 519.

Vandenberg, Arthur H., Jr., ed. by. *The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg.* Rev. by Winton H. Beaven. 102.
Vanderbilt, Arthur T., Philip Rhys Adams, Samuel H. Goldenson, Clyde Kluckhohn, and William G. Carr. *Modern Education and Human Values.* Rev. by A. Craig Baird. 507.
Van Dusen, C. Raymond. *Training the Voice for Speech.* (Rev. ed.). Rev. by Margaret Robb. 245.
Van Ormer, Edward B. and Charles F. Hoban, Jr., prepared by. *Instructional Film Research 1918-1950* (Rapid Mass Learning). Technical Report No. SDC-269-7-19. Rev. by Buell Whitehill, Jr. 244.
Van Riper, Charles. *A Case Book in Speech Therapy.* Rev. by Duane C. Spriestersbach. 513.

Wallace, Karl R. On the Criticism of the MacArthur Speech. 69.
——— and Donald C. Bryant. *Fundamentals of Public Speaking.* (Second ed.). Rev. by C. Horton Talley. 376.
Ward, Winifred, selected and edited by. *Stories to Dramatize.* Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 244.
Warfel, Harry A. *Who Killed Grammar?* Rev. by Norman C. Stageberg. 232.
Wells, Charlotte G. Rev.: *Diagnostic Manual in Speech Correction.* Wendell Johnson, Frederic Darley, and D. C. Spriestersbach. 233.
West, E. J. Rev.: *Shakespearian Players and Performances.* Arthur Colby Sprague. 372.
——— Rev.: *Shakespearean Stage Production: Then & Now. A Manual for the Scholar-Player.* Cécile de Banke. 515.
——— Rev.: *The Theater Dictionary: British and American Terms in the Drama, Opera, and Ballet.* Wilfred Granville. 378.
——— Rev.: *The Theatre: Three Thousand Years of Drama, Acting and Stagecraft.* Sheldon Cheney. 243.
Westlake, Harold. Understanding the Child with a Cleft Palate. 165.
White, Eugene E. George Whitefield and the Paper War in New England. 61.
White, Hollis L. Rev.: *Alexander Hamilton: Nation Builder.* Nathan Schachner. 240.
Whitehead, A. E. Rev.: *Project Text for Public Speaking.* Clark S. Carlile. 512.
Whitehill, Buell, Jr. Rev.: *Instructional Film Research 1918-1950.* (Rapid Mass Learning). Technical Report No. SDC 269-7-19. Prepared by Charles F. Hoban, Jr. and Edward B. Van Ormer. 244.
Wiksell, Wesley. Rev.: *The Humor of Humor.* Evan Esar. 248.
Wiley, Earl W. Rev.: *Lincoln and Greeley.* Harlan Hoyt Horner. 361.
——— Rev.: *Lincoln—A Picture Story of His Life.* Stefan Lorant. 103.
Williams, Rollo Gillespie, F.I.E.S. *The Technique of Stage Lighting.* (Rev. ed.). Rev. by Willard F. Bellman. 246.
Williamson, Arleigh B. Rev.: *Parliamentary Procedure Simplified.* Melanie F. Menderson. 367.
Williamson, George. *A Reader's Guide to T. S. Eliot: A Poem-by-Poem Analysis.* Rev. by W. M. Parrish. 373.

Wilson, George and Vance Randolph. *Down in the Holler: A Gallery of Ozark Folk Speech.* Rev. by Cameron W. Garbutt. 374.
Wilson, J. Dover and T. C. Worsley. *Shakespeare's Histories at Stratford 1951.* Rev. by Paul Davee. 242.
Wise, C. M. and Ruth Hirsch. Directions in Linguistics. New Books in Review. 225.
Witherspoon, Alexander M. *Common Errors in English and How to Avoid Them.* Rev. by Donald E. Bird. 377.
Wolf, Hazel Catherine. *On Freedom's Altar: The Martyr Complex in the Abolition Movement.* Rev. by Robert G. Gunderson. 362.
Wood, Margaret. Rev.: *Developing Your Speaking Voice.* Harrison M. Karr. 366.
Woods, Baldwin M., Helen V. Hammarberg, Cyril O. Houle, S. E. Raybould, and E. A. Corbett. *Universities in Adult Education.* Rev. by David Potter. 247.
Woolley, Edwin C., Franklin W. Scott, and J. C. Tressler. *Handbook of Writing and Speaking.* (Second ed.). Rev. by Wayne L. Britton. 246.
Worsley, T. C. and J. Dover Wilson. *Shakespeare's Histories at Stratford 1951.* Rev. by Paul Davee. 242.
Wrage, Ernest J. and James H. McBurney. *The Art of Good Speech.* Rev. by J. M. O'Neill, 364.

Yeager, W. H. and W. P. Sandford. *Practical Business Speaking.* (Third ed.). Rev. by by Clara K. Mawhinney. 110.
Youngdahl, Reugen K. *A House for Tomorrow and Other Sermons.* Rev. by Elmer J. F. Arndt. 245.
Youngerman, Henry C. On Contest Audiences. The Forum. 348.
——— Rev.: *Propaganda Handbook: A Guide to Mass Persuasion.* D. Lincoln Harter and John Sullivan. 363.

Zelko, Harold P. Rev.: *Conciliation in Action: Principles and Techniques.* Edward Peters. 235.
Ziebarth, E. W. Rev.: *Verdict in Korea.* Robert T. Oliver. 238.

ARTICLES

Debate and Discussion

Concepts of Leadership. Franklyn S. Haiman. 317.
Graphic Techniques for Evaluating Discussion and Conference Procedures. Earnest Brandenburg and Philip A. Neal. 201.
Lighter Side of the Literary Societies, The. Charles W. Lomas. 45.
Ordinal Position Effect, The. Sam L. Becker. 217.
Oxford Union, The: American View. Richard Murphy and Howard Shuman. 49.
Rhetoric of Conciliation, The. Lyman Bryson. 437.

Drama and the Theatre

Dominative-Defensive Conflict as the Basis of Dramatic Structure, The. Milton Marx. 335.
Indian Treaties: The First American Dramas. A. M. Drummond and Richard Moody. 15.
New Goethe Discovery, A: The Weilburger Goethe-Funde. Eugene Bahn. 485.
On the Acting of Shakespeare's Plays. John Russell Brøwn. 477.
Shakespeare "All of a Breath." Robert Bruce Loper. 193.
Trifurcation of Drama and Theatre in English, The. John Gassner. 323.

Education

Analysis of Some Characteristics of Members of the Speech Association of America, An. Franklin H. Knower and Thomas E. Richmond. 312.
Bachelor's Degree in Speech in America. Franklin H. Knower and Twyla Jo Newhouse. 307.
Grammar and Rhetoric: The Teacher's Problem. Donald Davidson. 425.
New Buildings for Old. H. Philip Constans and Claude E. Kantner. 135.
Teaching of Speech to the Deaf, The. Powrie Vaux Doctor. 488.
Truth through Personality. Lionel Crocker. 1.

Language

Australian Speech. Clive Sansom. 470.
Don't Meddle Ignorantly with Your Language! Robert A. Hall, Jr. 42.
Dramatistic View of the Origins of Language, A. Part III. Kenneth Burke. 79.
Postscripts on the Negative. Kenneth Burke. 209.
Report on English in Europe, A. W. Cabell Greet. 465.

Oral Interpretation

Aristotle and the Modern Rhapsode. Robert Marsh. 491.
Melody in Verse. Carl E. Burklund. 57.
Philological and Speech-Method Interpretation of Poetry. Marie-Hed Kaulhausen. 340.
Scholarship and the Interpreter. Wallace A. Bacon. 187.

Phonetics and Speech Science

Modern View of Voice and Diction, A. Virgil A. Anderson. 25.
Vowels [e] and [o] in American Speech, The. G. E. Peterson and M. S. Coxe. 33.

Radio and Television

Current Status of Educational Television, The. Walter B. Emery. 173.

Rhetoric and Public Address

Aaron Burr's Farewell Address. Gordon L. Thomas. 273.
Defamation by Slander. George P. Rice, Jr. 75.
Difficult Duty of Speech, The. Robert Redfield. 6.
George Whitefield and the Paper War in New England. Eugene E. White. 61.
Gladstone's Essay on Public Speaking. Loren Reid. 265.
Harry Emerson Fosdick: Paragon and Paradox. Roy C. McCall. 283.
Mark Twain Abroad. E. James Lennon. 197.
Old Voices in the New South. William B. Hesseltine and Henry L. Ewbank, Jr. 451.
On the Criticism of the MacArthur Speech. Karl R. Wallace. 69.

Place of Oratory in American Literature, The. Barnet Baskerville. 459.
Rhetorical Criticism: A Burkeian Method. Virginia Holland. 444.
Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope. Donald C. Bryant. 401.
Rutherford B. Hayes as a Student of Speech at Kenyon College. Wyman W. Parker. 291.

SPEECH CORRECTION AND HEARING

Intelligibility of Abbreviated Speech Patterns, The. William David Garvey. 296.
Understanding the Child with a Cleft Palate. Harold Westlake. 165.

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

Adlai's Almanac. Edited and compiled by Bessie R. James and Mary Overstreet. Rev. by Wayne N. Thompson. 239.
Age of Criticism, An: 1900-1950. William Van O'Connor. Rev. by Guy A. Cardwell. 107.
Alexander Hamilton: Nation Builder. Nathan Schachner. Rev. by Hollis L. White. 240.
Always the Young Strangers. Carl Sandburg. Rev. by W. M. Parrish. 377.
American Problems Today. Robert Rienow. Rev. by Guy A. Cardwell. 377.
Andrew Marvell: Selected Poetry and Prose. Ed. by Dennis Davison. Rev. by L. H. Mouat. 247.
Approaches to Poetry. (Second ed.) Walter Blair and W. K. Chandler. Rev. by L. H. Mouat. 519.
Art of Communicating Ideas, The. W. J. Grace and J. C. Grace. Rev. by Herold Lillywhite. 100.
Art of Good Speech, The. James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage. Rev. by J. M. O'Neill. 364.
Art of Human Relations, The. Henry Clay Lindgren. Rev. by Franklyn S. Haiman. 364.
Basic Rules of Order. Thomas H. Eliot. Rev. by Sister Mary of the Cross, B.V.M. 242.
Basic Training in Speech. (Second ed.). Lester Thonssen and Howard Gilkinson. Rev. by Orville A. Hitchcock. 376.
Best Advice on How to Write. Ed. by Gorham Munson. Rev. by W. Norwood Brigance. 246.
Best American Plays. (Third Series—1945-1951). Ed. with Introduction by John Gassner. Rev. by Evelyn Konigsberg. 107.
Best Sermons. 1951-1952 Edition. Ed. by G. Paul Butler. Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 109.
Box, Pit, and Gallery: Stage and Society in Johnson's London. James J. Lynch. Rev. by William G. B. Carson. 373.
British Authors Before 1800. Ed. by Stanley J. Kunitz and Howard Haycraft. Rev. by Earnest Brandenburg. 378.
Broadcasting: Radio and Television. Henry L. Ewbank and Sherman P. Lawton. Rev. by Harrison B. Summers. 233.
Burlesque Tradition in the English Theatre After 1660, The. V. C. Clinton-Baddeley. Rev. by George R. Kernodle. 520.
Case Book in Speech Therapy, A. Charles Van Riper. Rev. by Duane C. Spriestersbach. 513.
Celebrated Mrs. Centlivre, The. John Wilson Bowyer. Rev. by George R. Kernodle. 247.
Champion Campaigner Franklin D. Roosevelt. Harold F. Gosnell. Rev. by Earnest Brandenburg. 104.
Classics in Translation. Ed. by Paul MacKendrick and Herbert M. Howe. Vol. I: Greek Literature; Vol. II: Latin Literature. Rev. by Otto A. Dieter. 237.
Common Errors in English and How to Avoid Them. Alexander M. Witherspoon. Rev. by Donald E. Bird. 377.
Communion through Preaching: The Monstrance of the Gospel. Henry Sloane Coffin. Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 516.
Composing the Speech. Glen E. Mills. Rev. by Max Fuller. 98.
Conciliation in Action: Principles and Techniques. Edward Peters. Rev. by Harold P. Zelko. 235.
Conversation and Communication. Joost A. M. Meerloo. Rev. by Cullen B. Owens. 106.
Creative Dramatics for Children. Frances Caldwell Durland. Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 375.
Cultivation of Community Leaders, The. William W. Biddle. Rev. by Franklyn S. Haiman. 377.
Deaf Children in a Hearing World. Miriam Forster Fiedler. Rev. by S. Richard Silverman. 233.
Developing Your Speaking Voice. Harrison M. Karr. Rev. by Margaret Wood. 366.
Diagnostic Manual in Speech Correction. Wendell Johnson, Frederic Darley, and D. C. Spriestersbach. Rev. by Charlotte G. Wells. 233.
Die Kunst Der Politischen Rede In England. Hildegard Gauger. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 247.
Directing the Play: A Source Book of Stagecraft, Edited, with an Illustrated History of Directing, by Toby Cole and Helen Krich Chinoy. Rev. by Harold Crain. 514.
Directions in Linguistics. C. M. Wise and Ruth Hirsch. New Books in Review. 225.
Discussion and Debate. William A. Behl. Rev. by Harvey Cromwell. 366.
Documentary History of the United States, A. Richard D. Heffner. Rev. by Robert G. Gunderson. 240.
Down in the Holler: A Gallery of Ozark Folk Speech. Vance Randolph and George Wilson. Rev. by Cameron W. Garbutt. 374.
Education and the Nature of Man. Earl C. Kelley and Marie I. Rasey. Rev. by W. Norwood Brigance. 105.
Education for Freedom and Responsibility. Edmund Ezra Day. Rev. by A. Craig Baird. 507.
Effective Communication: A Guide to Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening. Howard H. Dean. Rev. by Herold Lillywhite. 513.
Effective Public Relations. Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center. Rev. by C. W. Freed. 110.
Effective Reading. Lawrence H. Feigenbaun. Rev. by James I. Brown. 519.
English Composition. A. F. Scott. Rev. by Mardel Ogilvie. 378.
English Poetry: The Main Currents from Chaucer to the Present. Douglas Bush. Rev. by Norman C. Stageberg. 248.
Faith of our Fathers, The, an Anthology of Americana, 1790-1860. Ed. by Irving Mark and Eugene L. Schwaab. Rev. by Jonathan Curvin. 241.

Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Apprenticeship. Frank Freidel. Rev. by Laura Crowell. 240.
Fundamentals of Public Speaking. (Second ed.). Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace. Rev. by C. Horton Talley. 376.
General Education in School and College: A Committee Report. Rev. by Thomas S. Hall. 510.
Good American Speech. (Rev. ed.). Margaret McLean. Rev. by F. Lincoln D. Holmes. 108.
Good for a Laugh. Bennett Cerf. Rev. by Don Streeter. 111.
Great Books: Panacea or What? Edward A. Fitzpatrick. Rev. by W. Norwood Brigance. 110.
Groups in Harmony and Tension. Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif. Rev. by Nathan Kohn, Jr. 518.
Guide to Effective Public Speaking, A. Lawrence Henry Mouat. Rev. by W. Arthur Cable. 365.
Handbook of Writing and Speaking. (Second ed.). Edwin C. Woolley, Franklin W. Scott, and J. C. Tressler. Rev. by Wayne L. Britton. 246.
House for Tomorrow and Other Sermons, A. Reugen K. Youngdahl. Rev. by Elmer J. F. Arndt. 245.
How to Be a Successful Emcee. LeRoy Stahl. Rev. by Robert Haakenson. 518.
How to Say a Few Words. David Guy Powers. Rev. by Clark S. Carlile. 368.
How to Understand Propaganda. Alfred McClung Lee. Rev. by Glen E. Mills. 109.
Humor of Humor, The. Evan Esar. Rev. by Wesley Wiksell. 248.
Impatient Crusader. Josephine Goldmark. Rev. by Orville Hitchcock. 508.
Improving the Child's Speech. Virgil A. Anderson. Rev. by Velma B. Hiser. 514.
Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States: From George Washington, 1789, to Harry S. Truman, 1949. Rev. by J. Jeffery Auer. 246.
Informal Guide to Public Speaking, An. (Rev. ed.). William Freeman. Ed. by Quincy Howe. Rev. by Harvey Cromwell. 376.
In Quest of God's Power. Charles L. Allen. Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 109.
Instructional Film Research 1918-1950 (Rapid Mass Learning). Tech. Report No. SDC 269-7-19. Prepared by Charles F. Hoban, Jr. and Edward B. Van Ormer. Rev. by Buell Whitehill, Jr. 244.
Integrative Speech. Elwood Murray, Raymond H. Barnard, and J. V. Garland, in collaboration with Guthrie E. Janssen. Rev. by Wilbur E. Moore. 511.
Intergroup Education in Public Schools. Hilda Taba, Elizabeth Hall Brady, and John T. Robinson. Rev. by Franklyn S. Haiman. 241.
Introduction to Eighteenth Century Drama, 1700-1780, An. Frederick S. Boas. Rev. by William G. B. Carson. 373.
It Takes Time: An Autobiography of the Teaching Profession. Marie I. Rasey. Rev. by Gladys L. Borchers. 518.
Jefferson Reader: A Treasury of Writings About Thomas Jefferson. Ed. by Francis Coleman Rosenberger. Rev. by Mary Louise Gehring. 363.
John Wise: Early American Democrat. George Allan Cook. Rev. by William H. Bos. 363.
Letters of Sherwood Anderson. Ed. by Howard Mumford Jones. Rev. by Joseph Baldwin. 372.
Lincoln and Greeley. Harlan Hoyt Horner. Rev. by Earl W. Wiley. 361.
Lincoln—A Picture Story of His Life. Stefan Lorant. Rev. by Earl W. Wiley. 103.
Living Theatre. Ed. by Alice Venezky Griffin. Foreword by Helen Hayes. Rev. by Lee Norvelle. 378.
Logic and Language. (Second series). A. G. N. Flew. Rev. by Seth A. Fessenden. 371.
Logic, The Art of Defining and Reasoning. John A. Oesterle. Rev. by Waldo W. Braden. 111.
Major Campaign Speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson—1952. Rev. by Richard Murphy. 505.
Measurement of Hearing, The. Ira J. Hirsh. Rev. by John W. Black. 100.
Meeting of Minds: A Way to Peace through Mediation. Elmore Jackson. Rev. by Gregg Phifer. 98.
Modern Education and Human Values. Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Philip Rhys Adams, Samuel H. Goldenson, Clyde Kluckhohn, and William G. Carr. Rev. by A. Craig Baird. 507.
Notebook for Voice and Diction. Lyle V. Mayer. Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 376.
Notes on Scene Painting. Bradford Ashworth. Rev. by Willard Bellman. 378.
N. R. B. Public Speaking Manual. Compiled by the Editorial Staff of the National Research Bureau, Inc., Chicago. Rev. by Earnest Brandenburg. 517.
On Freedom's Altar: The Martyr Complex in the Abolition Movement. Hazel Catherine Wolf. Rev. by Robert G. Gunderson. 362.
Oral Communication of Literature. Gail Boardman. Rev. by Margaret Robb. 101.
Out of the Blue. John Crosby. Rev. by Giraud Chester. 101.
Parliamentary Law for the Layman. Joseph F. O'Brien. Rev. by Kim Giffin. 100.
Parliamentary Procedure Simplified. Melanie F. Menderson. Rev. by Arleigh B. Williamson. 367.
People, Places, and Books. Gilbert Highet. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 377.
Persuasion: A Means of Social Control. Winston Lamont Brembeck and William Smiley Howell. Rev. by Waldo W. Braden. 99.
Philosophy of Psychiatry, The. Harold Palmer. Rev. by Cullen B. Owens. 111.
Play Direction, John Dietrich. Rev. by Harold Crain. 514.
Playwright at Work. John Van Druten. Rev. by George R. Kernodle. 515.
Pocket Primer of Parliamentary Procedure. (Fourth ed.). Fred G. Stevenson. Rev. by Kim Giffin. 100.
Poems for Study. Leonard Unger and William Van O'Connor. Rev. by Joseph Baldwin. 519.
Poetic Approach to Language, The. V. K. Gokak. Rev. by L. H. Mouat. 370.
Practical Business Speaking. (Third ed.). W. P. Sandford and W. H. Yeager. Rev. by Clara K. Mawhinney. 110.
Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg, The. Ed. by Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr. Rev. by Winton H. Beaven. 102.

Producing the Play. John Gassner; together with the *New Scene Technician's Handbook* by Philip Barber. (Rev. ed.). Rev. by Richard L. Scammon. 246.
Project Text for Public Speaking. Clark S. Carlile. Rev. by A. E. Whitehead. 512.
Propaganda Handbook: A Guide to Mass Persuasion. D. Lincoln Harter and John Sullivan. Rev. by Henry C. Youngerman. 363.
Public Speaking for the Professions and Clubs. Samuel Kahn. Rev. by Wayne L. Britton. 235.
Questionnaire for a Linguistic Atlas of England, A. Eugen Dieth and Harold Orton. Rev. by Cameron W. Garbutt. 108.
Radio and Television Communication. Charles Frederick Lindsley. Rev. by Robert Haakenson. 234.
Reader in Public Opinion and Communication. (Rev. ed.) Ed. by Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz. Rev. by Elwood Murray. 516.
Reader's Guide to T. S. Eliot, A: A Poem-by-Poem Analysis. George Williamson. Rev. by W. M. Parrish. 373.
Reading Skills. William D. Baker. Rev. by James I. Brown. 519.
Recent Books in Radio and Television. Giraud Chester. New Books in Review. 353.
Recent Literature in Discussion. J. Jeffery Auer. New Books in Review. 95.
Recent Literature in Rhetoric. Lester Thonssen. New Books in Review. 501.
Representative American Plays, From 1767 to the Present. (Seventh ed.) Ed. by Arthur Hobson Quinn. Rev. by Harold Crain. 519.
Representative American Speeches: 1952-1953. Ed. by A. Craig Baird. Rev. by Dallas C. Dickey. 518.
Robert Browning. J. M. Cohen. Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 248.
Romance of the English Theatre, The. (Rev. ed.) Donald Brook. Rev. by Thomas D. Pawley. 519.
Samuel Johnson's Literary Criticism. Jean H. Hagstrom. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 236.
Secret of Pulpit Power, The. Simon Blocker. Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 516.
Semantics and the Philosophy of Language: A Collection of Readings. Ed. by Leonard Linsky. Rev. by Wendell Johnson. 231.
Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions. Alfred Harbage. Rev. by Hubert C. Heffner. 371.
Shakespearean Stage Production: Then & Now. A Manual for the Scholar-Player. Cécile de Banke. Rev. by E. J. West. 515.
Shakespeare's Histories at Stratford 1951. J. Dover Wilson and T. C. Worsley. Rev. by Paul Davee. 242.
Shakespeare's Motley. Leslie Hotson. Rev. by William Ringler. 111.
Shakespearian Players and Performances. Arthur Colby Sprague. Rev. by E. J. West. 372.
Speech and Hearing in Communication. Harvey Fletcher. Rev. by Ira J. Hirsh. 367.
Speeches of Adlai Stevenson. Prepared under the editorial supervision of Richard Harrity. Rev. by Wayne N. Thompson. 239.
Speech for the Classroom Teacher. (Rev. ed.). Dorothy I. Mulgrave. Rev. by Hugh F. Seabury. 110.
Speech Fundamentals. Harry G. Barnes and Loretta Wagner Smith. Rev. by G. Bradford Barber. 512.
Speech Improvement. Letitia Raubicheck. Rev. by F. Lincoln D. Holmes. 108.
Speechreading—Jena Method. (Rev. ed.). Anna M. Bunger. Rev. by Audrey A. Simmons. 378.
Spinoza Dictionary. Ed. with an Introduction by Dagobert D. Runes. With a Foreword by Albert Einstein. Rev. by Otto A. Dieter. 247.
Spirit of Liberty, The: Papers and Addresses of Learned Hand. Collected and with an introduction and notes by Irving Dilliard. Rev. by Frederick W. Haberman. 237.
Stagecraft and Scene Design. Herbert Philippi. Rev. by Charles W. Philhour. 243.
Stage Manager's Handbook, The. Bert Gruver. Rev. by Lewis G. McFarland. 515.
Standard Handbook of Prepositions, Conjunctions, Relative Pronouns and Adverbs. Comp. by the Funk and Wagnalls Editorial Staff. Rev. by Donald E. Bird. 246.
Stir up the Gift. Paul S. Rees. Rev. by Charles A. McGlon. 516.
Stories and Games for Easy Lipreading Practice. Rose V. Feilbach. Rev. by Jane Beasley. 246.
Stories to Dramatize. Selected and edited by Winifred Ward. Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 244.
Story of English, The. Mario Pei. Rev. by Lee S. Hultzén. 105.
Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles. Alexander Turyn. Rev. by Otto A. Dieter. 236.
Sunday Evening Sermons. Ed. by Alton M. Motter. Rev. by Elmer J. F. Arndt. 245.
Taste and Criticism in the Eighteenth Century. (Life, Literature and Thought Library). Ed. by H. A. Needham. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 236.
Teacher of Teachers, The. Harold Rugg. Rev. by Karl F. Robinson. 368.
Technique of Stage Lighting, The. (Rev. ed.). Rollo Gillespie Williams, F.I.E.S. Rev. by Willard F. Bellman. 246.
Television Policy for Education, A. Ed. by Carroll V. Newsom. Rev. by Giraud Chester. 234.
Theater Dictionary, The: British and American Terms in the Drama, Opera, and Ballet. Wilfred Granville. Rev. by E. J. West. 378.
Theatre Annual, The, 1952. Volume X. Ed. by Blanche A. Corwin. Rev. by Harry R. McClain. 244.
Theatre, The: Three Thousand Years of Drama, Acting and Stagecraft. Sheldon Cheney. Rev. by E. J. West. 243.
Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases. Revised from Peter Roget by D. C. Browning. Rev. by Lionel Crocker. 520.
Things Worth Fighting For. Speeches by Joseph Benedict Chifley. Selected and arranged by A. W. Stargardt, with a Foreword by H. V. Evatt. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 239.
Training for the Stage. Dorothy Birch. Foreword by Donald Wolfit. Rev. by Lee Norvelle. 374.

Training the Voice for Speech. (Rev. ed.). C. Raymond Van Dusen. Rev. by Margaret Robb. 245.
Triumph of the English Language, The: A Survey of Opinions Concerning the Vernacular from the Introduction of Printing to the Restoration. Richard Foster Jones. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 369.
Truth is Our Weapon. Edward W. Barrett. Rev. by Giraud Chester. 506.
Universe of Meaning, The. Samuel Reiss. Rev. by Irving J. Lee. 370.
Universities in Adult Education. Cyril O. Houle, S. E. Raybould, E. A. Corbett, Baldwin M. Woods, and Helen V. Hammarberg. Rev. by David Potter. 247.
Using Our Language. David H. Patton and Althea Beery with the assistance of Martha Leeds and Ollie Backus. Rev. by Mardel Ogilvie. 375.
Verdict in Korea. Robert T. Oliver. Rev. by E. W. Ziebarth. 238.
Vision in Television: The Origins and Potentialities of Educational Television. Hazel Cooley. Rev. by Giraud Chester. 234.
Webster's New World Dictionary. Rev. by Don Streeter. 519.
Who Killed Grammar? Harry A. Warfel. Rev. by Norman C. Stageberg. 232.
Who Shall Survive? Foundations of Sociometry, Group Psychotherapy and Sociodrama. J. L. Moreno. Rev. by Elwood Murray. 368.
Willkie: The Events He Was Part of—The Ideas He Fought for. Joseph Barnes. Rev. by Albert J. Croft. 104.
Winston Churchill: The Era and the Man. Virginia Cowles. Rev. by Halbert E. Gulley. 509.
Woodrow Wilson's Own Story. Ed. by Donald Day. Rev. by Clair R. Henderlider. 103.
Words of Justice Brandeis, The. Ed. by Solomon Goldman and with a Foreword by Justice William O. Douglas. Rev. by Dallas C. Dickey. 362.
Working for Democracy. (Rev. ed.). Lyman Bryson and George Kerry Smith. Rev. by Gregg Phifer. 110.
Writer in America, The. Van Wyck Brooks. Rev. by James J. Stansell. 377.
Written Word and Other Essays, The. Hardin Craig. Rev. by Carroll C. Arnold. 509.
Your Voice and Speech. Letitia Raubicheck. Rev. by G. Bradford Barber. 518.

THE FORUM

Action in December. Bower Aly. The Forum. 347.
Budgets, The. The Forum. 224.
Committees for 1953. The Forum. 222.
Defects of Discussion. Walter F. Stromer. The Forum. 349.
Ethics of Free Speech, The. The Forum. 94.
Excerpts from the Minutes of the Executive Council. The Forum. 221.
Freedom and Security. Bower Aly. The Forum. 93.
New Light on Burke. Donald C. Bryant. The Forum. 351.
New Staff, A. Bower Aly. The Forum. 499.
On Contest Audiences. Henry C. Youngerman. The Forum. 348.
Presidents of SAA. Richard Henstrom. The Forum. 220.
Proposed Constitutional Amendment. The Forum. 500.
Report of Committee. Bower Aly, Dallas Dickey, Elise Hahn, Evelyn Konigsberg. The Forum. 347.
Report of the Nominating Committee. The Forum. 220.
Resolution on Freedom of Speech. The Forum. 223.
Revision of By-Laws. The Forum. 223.
Speech Buildings Today. Bower Aly. The Forum. 220.
Speech in the Arts College. Brooks Quimby. The Forum. 347.

COMMENTARIES

Brevity as an Element of Style. Montaigne. Commentary. 290.
Conspicuous Consumption of Language. Thorstein Veblen. Commentary. 306.
Critical Genius. *Amiel's Journal.* Commentary. 74.
Delivery. Gilbert Highet. Commentary. 322.
Edwin Booth as Hamlet. Eugene Field. Commentary. 484.
Faculty Members and Educational Television. Edward C. Lambert. Commentary. 186.
Fiery Life of the Moment, The. Ralph Waldo Emerson. Commentary. 464.
Goethe as Producer and Director. Arthur Woehl. Commentary. 487.
Growth of Knowledge, The. James Harris. Commentary. 322.
Growth of Speech Education, The. Charles H. Woolbert. Commentary. 311.
"Hear, Hear." A. P. Herbert. Commentary. 272.
High School Forensics and the Speech Curriculum. Karl F. Robinson. Commentary. 380.
Logic of the Law of Libel, The. J. Fenimore Cooper. Commentary. 78.
Nuances of Vowel Pronunciation. George P. Marsh. Commentary. 41.
Opposites. Plato. Commentary. 92.
Pains to be Perspicuous. Adam Smith. Commentary. 219.
Praise and Jealousy. Thucydides. Commentary. 164.
Pride of Pedants, The. Marco Girolamo Vida. Commentary. 192.
Psychology of the Shibboleth, The. Edwin R. Guthrie. Commentary. 322.
Relationship of Speech to Other Areas, The. Everett Lee Hunt. Commentary. 316.
Scotsman Listens to Americans, A. John M. Duncan. Commentary. 469.
Speaking to a Southern Audience. Irvin S. Cobb. Commentary. 458.
Style. Phillips Brooks. Commentary. 282.
Thought and Language. Thucydides. Commentary. 44.